



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

P.O. 185
F.M. 27
CPB. 15/5

सं. 32] नई दिल्ली, अगस्त 5—अगस्त 11, 2007, शनिवार/श्रावण 14—श्रावण 20, 1929
No. 32] NEW DELHI, AUGUST 5—AUGUST 11, 2007, SATURDAY/SRAVANA 14—SRAVANA 20, 1929

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके ।
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद एवं सीमा शुल्क मुख्य आयुक्त का कार्यालय

विशाखापट्टनम, 31 जुलाई, 2007

संख्या-1/2007-सी.शु.

का.आ. 2208.—भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, नई दिल्ली की अधिसूचना संख्या 33/94-सी.शु. (गै. टे.), दिनांक 1 जुलाई, 1994 यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना संख्या 122/2004-सी.शु. (गै.टे.), दिनांक 25-10-2004 के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, आंध्र प्रदेश राज्य के पेद्दापुरम, पेद्दापुरम मंडल, पूर्वी गोदावरी जिला को सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) के खण्ड 9 के अन्तर्गत भाण्डागार केन्द्र घोषित करता हूँ।

[फा. सं. VIII/48/21/2007-मु.आ. (वि.क्षे.)]

पी. एन. विट्टल दास, मुख्य आयुक्त

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF
CENTRAL EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

Visakhapatnam, the 31st July, 2007

No. 1/2007-CUS.

S.O. 2208.—In exercise of the powers delegated to the undersigned vide Notification No. 33/94-Cus. (NT), dtd. 1-7-94 as amended by Notification No. 122/2004-Cus. (NT) dated 25-10-2004 of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi, I hereby declare Peddapuram, Peddapuram Mandal, East Godavary District in the State of Andhra Pradesh to be a Warehousing Station, under Section 9, of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962).

[F. No. VIII/48/21/2007-CC (VZ)]

P. N. VITTAL DASS, Chief Commissioner

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2209.—चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड की तिरुवनंतपुरम सलाहकार पैनल का गठन करती है और निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को उक्त पैनल में सदस्यों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है। यह इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 12-7-2005 की अधिसूचना सं. 809/5/2004 एफ (सी) का अतिक्रमण करती है।

1. श्री के. अनंदा कुमार
2. प्रो. के. बालाकृष्णन
3. डा. लिज्जी फ्रांसिस
4. श्री के. कृष्णा कुमार
5. श्रीमती चन्द्रामती अम्मा
6. श्री के. जे. राफी
7. श्रीमती पद्माजा राधाकृष्णन
8. श्री टी. के. राधाकृष्णन पिल्लै
9. श्री अनिल अक्कारा
10. श्री जोसेफ बाबू वी.वी.
11. श्री वी. वी. प्रकाश
12. श्रीमती शोभा सोमाशेखरन्
13. श्री माधवन पिल्लै
14. श्री के. एस. शाहजी
15. श्री के. एम. जोसेफ
16. श्री जयमोन अर्यकुन्न
17. श्री इ बी आई जार्ज
18. श्री अनिल थॉमस
19. श्री थंकामोनी दिवाकरन्
20. श्रीमती दीप्ति प्रदीप कुमार
21. श्री एस. के. शिवशंकरन्
22. श्री शरत चन्द्रन्
23. श्री पी. एस. बाबुराज
24. श्री सूर्या कृष्णामूर्ति
25. श्री जोसेफ मैथ्यू पलाई
26. श्री रोज मेरी

27. श्री के. पी. अनिल कुमार
28. श्रीमती लक्ष्मी नाथ
29. श्री एम. एफ. थामस
30. डा. (श्रीमती) अनिता कुमार
31. श्रीमती बिन्दू बालाकृष्णन्
32. श्री पैलोदे रवि
33. श्री आर. एस. प्रदीप कुमार
34. सुश्री गिरिजा सेथुनाथ

[फा. सं. 809/6/2007-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2007

S.O. 2209.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952), read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to constitute the Thiruvananthapuram Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification and to appoint the following persons as members of the said panel with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier. This supersedes this Ministry's Notification No. 809/9/2004-F(C) dated 15th June, 2005.

1. Shri K. Ananda Kumar
2. Prof. K. Balakrishnan
3. Dr. Lizzy Francis
4. Shri K. Krishna Kumar
5. Smt. Chandramathi Amma
6. Shri K. J. Raphy
7. Smt. Padmaja Rakhakrishnan
8. Shri T. K. Radhakrishnan Pillai
9. Shri Anil Akkara
10. Shri Joseph Babu V. V.
11. Shri V. V. Prakash
12. Smt. Sobha Somasekharan
13. Shri Madhavan Pillai
14. Shri K. S. Shaji
15. Shri K. M. Joseph
16. Shri Jaimon Ayarkunnan
17. Shri EBI George
18. Shri Anil Thomas
19. Shri Thankamoni Divakaran
20. Smt. Deepthi Pradeep Kumar

21. Shri M. K. Sivasankaran
22. Shri Sarath Chandran
23. Shri P. S. Baburaj
24. Shri Soorya Krishna Moorthi
25. Shri Joseph Mathew Palai
26. Shri Rose Mary
27. Shri K. P. Anil Kumar
28. Smt. Lakshmi Nair
29. Shri M. F. Thomas
30. Dr. (Smt.) Anitha Kumari
31. Smt. Bindu Balakrishnan
32. Shri Palode Ravi
33. Shri R. S. Pradeep Kumar
34. Ms. Girija Sethunath

[F. No. 809/6/2007-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2210.—चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार, तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के बंगलौर सलाहकार पैनल निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को नियुक्त करती है। यह इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 12-7-2005 के सदस्यों के रूप में अधिसूचना सं. 809/5/2004-एफ (सी) का अतिक्रमण करती है।

1. श्रीमती डी. एच. विजया
2. श्रीमती एम. सुधामनी
3. सुश्री अनीता वसंत
4. श्रीमती गीता नोरोन्हा
5. श्री एम. शैरोन लोपेज
6. श्री एस. एन. पाटिल
7. श्री एम. एस. नरसिम्हामूर्ति
8. श्रीमती (डा.) के. चंद्रिका
9. श्री गंगाधर मुदालियर
10. श्रीमती डा. विजया
11. श्री मौ. शफी उल्लाह
12. श्रीमती वाणी भरत
13. श्री मुंजाने सत्या
14. श्री (डा.) यू. बी. जोशी
15. श्री सी. एम. धनंजय

16. श्री के. शिवारामा कृष्ण
17. श्री एस. डी. अकालगी
18. श्री एस. नारायणस्वामी
19. श्री बाई. आर. जयराम
20. प्रो. ए. श्रीधरा
21. श्री शंकरगौड़ा पाटिल
22. श्री एन. आर. गणामूर्ति
23. श्री ज्योतिप्रसाद हेगड़े
24. श्री एस. महेन्द्र
25. श्री मोहम्मद अकरम
26. श्री टी. अमरनाथ
27. श्रीमती हेमलता
28. श्रीमती शशिप्रभा होरेमठ
29. श्रीमती श्रीललिता
30. श्री बी. ई. श्रीदेवी
31. श्रीमती राधा वेंकटेश
32. श्रीमती निर्मला जयाराम
33. श्रीमती के. जी. नागालक्ष्मी बाई
34. श्रीमती प्रफुल्ला मधुकर
35. श्रीमती सुजयालक्ष्मी अरसू
36. श्रीमती गायत्री कुरतीकोटी
37. श्रीमती प्रामिला जोसाई
38. श्रीमती आर. आंशा
39. श्रीमती (डा.) गिरिजा महेशन

[फा. सं. 809/5/2007-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2007

S.O. 2210.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952), read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to constitute the Bangalore Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification and to appoint the following persons as members of the said panel with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier. This supersedes this Ministry's Notification No. 809/5/2004-F(C) dated 12th July, 2005.

1. Smt. D. H. Vijaya
2. Smt. M. Sudhamani
3. Ms. Anita Vasanth

4. Smt. Geetha Noronha
5. Shri M. Sharon Lopez
6. Shri S. N. Patil
7. Shri M. S. Narasimhamurthy
8. Smt. (Dr.) K. Chandrika
9. Shri Gangadhara Mudaliar
10. Smt. (Dr.) Vijaya
11. Shri Mohd. Shafiulla
12. Smt. Vani Bharath
13. Shri Munjane Sathya
14. Shri (Dr.) U. B. Joshi
15. Shri C. M. Dhananjaya
16. Shri K. Shivarama Krista
17. Shri S. D. Ankalgi
18. Shri S. Narayanaswamy
19. Shri Y. R. Jairaj
20. Prof. A. Sridhara
21. Shri Shankargouda Patil
22. Shri N. R. Gnana Murthy
23. Shri Joythiprasad Hegde
24. Shri S. Mahendar
25. Shri Mohd. Akram
26. Shri T. Amarnath
27. Smt. Hemalatha
28. Smt. Shashiprabha Hiremath
29. Smt. Sreelalitha
30. Shri B. E. Sridevi
31. Smt. Radha Venkatesh
32. Smt. Nirmala Jayaram
33. Smt. K. G. Nagalakshmi Bai
34. Smt. Profulla Madhukar
35. Smt. Sujayalakshmi Arasu
36. Smt. Gayathri Kurtikoti
37. Smt. Pramila Joshai
38. Ms. R. Asha
39. Smt. (Dr.) Girija Maheshan

[F. No. 809/5/2007-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2211.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 31 मई, 2007 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र

अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के हैदराबाद सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में श्री टंकला सुधाकारा राव, एन.एन. कालोनी, कोटदूरू, श्रीकाकुलम, जिला आंध्र प्रदेश-532455 को नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/1/2007-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2007

S.O. 2211.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 31st May, 2007 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri Tankala Sudhakara Rao, N. N. Colony, Kotturu, Srikakulam District, Andhra Pradesh-532455 as a member of the Hyderabad advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 809/1/2007-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2212.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 29-3-2007 की सम- संख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के चेन्नई सलाहकार पैनल में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को नियुक्त करती है :-

1. श्री सी.एस.एस.एन. अरुण राजा, ओल्ड सं. 31/न्यू नं. 18, न्यू बंगला स्ट्रीट, चिताथिरी पेट्टई, चेन्नई-600002
2. श्री सी. आर. भास्करन, 2/1, जीवनाथम सलाई, वेस्ट के. के. नगर, चेन्नई-600078

[फा. सं. 809/2/2007-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2007

S.O. 2212.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 29-3-2007 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Chennai Advisory panel of the

Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

- (1) Shri C.S.S.N. Arun Raja, Old No. 31/New No. 18, New Bungalow Street, Chintathiri Pettai, Chennai-600002.
- (2) Shri C. R. Baskaran, 2/1, Jeevanantham Salai, West K. K. Nagar, Chennai-600078.

[F.No. 809/2/2007-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2213.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 31 मई, 2007 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के हैदराबाद सलाहकार पैनल में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को नियुक्त करती है :

1. श्री पी. शरत कुमार, निवासी जयाविला, एच.एम.टी. नगर, नाचराम, हैदराबाद ।
2. श्री एस. वेंकटेश्वर रेड्डी म. नं. 3.6.345, बी-7, मीरा अपार्टमेंट्स, स्काईलाइन थिएटर के पीछे बशीरबाग, हैदराबाद-500029

[फा. सं. 809/1/2007-एफ (सी)]

संगीता सिंह, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 18th July, 2007

S.O. 2213.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 31st May, 2007 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following as members of the Hyderabad Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

- (1) Shri P. Sarath Kumar, R/o Jayavilla, HMT Nagar, Nacharam, Hyderabad.
- (2) Shri S. Venkateshwar Reddy, H. No. 3-6-345, B-7, Meera Apartments, Opp. Skyline Theatre, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad-500029.

[F.No. 809/1/2007-F(C)]

SANGEETA SINGH, Director (Films)

संचार और सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

(दूरसंचार विभाग)

(राजभाषा अनुभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2214.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम 1976 (यथा संशोधित 1987) के नियम 10 (4) के अनुसरण में संचार और सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय, दूरसंचार विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिसमें 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है :

मुख्य महाप्रबंधक दूरसंचार, कर्नाटक परिमण्डल, भा.सं. नि.लि, बेंगलूर

1. महा प्रबंधक दूरसंचार जिला कार्यालय, बिजापुर
2. जिला तार घर, बिजापुर

[सं. ई. 11016/1/2007 (रा.भा.)]

बलराम शर्मा, संयुक्त सचिव (प्रशासन)

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

(Department of Telecommunications)

(O. L. Section)

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2007

S.O. 2214.—In pursuance of rule 10 (4) of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union), rules, 1976 (as amended, 1987), the Central Government hereby notifies the following Offices under the Administrative Control of the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, Department of Telecommunications where more than 80% of staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi

Chief General Manager Telecom. Karnataka Circle, B.S.N.L., Bangalore

1. Office of General Manager, Telecom, Distt., Bijapur.
2. Distt. Telegraph Office, Bijapur.

[No. E. 11016/1/2007 (O.L.)]

BALRAM SHARMA, Jt. Secy. (Adm.)

रेल मंत्रालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2215.—रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड), राजभाषा नियम 1976 (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) के नियम 10 के

उपनियम (2) और (4) के अनुसरण में, दक्षिण-पूर्व रेलवे के चक्रधरपुर मंडल के सहायक मंडल इंजीनियर कार्यालय, चाईबासा तथा क्षेत्रीय प्रबंधक कार्यालय, टाटा नगर को, जहां 80% से अधिक अधिकारियों/कर्मचारियों ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

[सं. हिंदी-2007/रा. भा. 1/12/3]

कृष्णा शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक, (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2007

S.O. 2215.—Ministry of Railways (Railway Board), in pursuance of Sub Rules (2) and (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for the Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 hereby, notify the Office of the Assistant Divisional Engineer, Chaibasa and office of the Area Manager, Tatanagar of Chakradharpur Division of South-Eastern Railway, where 80% or more Officers/ Employees have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. Hindi-2007/O.L.1/12/3]

KRISHNA SHARMA, Jr. Director (O.L.)

नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 2 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2214.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, नागर विमानन मंत्रालय से संबद्ध नागर विमानन महानिदेशालय के अधीनस्थ कार्यालय, नियंत्रक उड़नयोग्यता का कार्यालय, नागर विमानन विभाग, हैदराबाद हवाई अड्डा, हैदराबाद जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. ई-11020/6/2006-हिन्दी]

चन्द्रभान नारनौली, निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 2nd August, 2007

S.O. 2216.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Language (use of official purpose of the Union) Rules 1976, the Central Government hereby notified of the Controller of Airworthiness, Hyderabad Airport, Hyderabad, subordinate office of the Director General of Civil Aviation, an attached office of Ministry of Civil Aviation. Whereof more than 80% staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. E-11020/6/2006-Hindi]

C. B. NARNAULI, Director (OL)

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय

(उच्चतर शिक्षा विभाग)

(राजभाषा प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2217.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम 4 के अनुसरण में मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय (स्कूल शिक्षा और शिक्षा विभाग) के अन्तर्गत नवोदय विद्यालय समिति के अधीन जवाहर नवोदय विद्यालय गोंदवाल साहिब, जिला अमृतसर (पंजाब) को ऐसे कार्यालय के रूप में, जिसके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. 11011-7/2005-रा.भा.ए.]

केशव देसिराजु, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Higher Education)

(O.L. Division)

New Delhi, the 18th July, 2007

S.O. 2217.—In pursuance of sub rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Goindwal Sahib, Distt. Amritsar (Punjab) an office of Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti under the Ministry of Human Resource Development, (Deptt. of School Education and Literacy) as office, whose more than 80% members of the Staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. 11011-7/2005-O.L.U.]

KESHAV DESIRAJU, Jr. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2218.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम 4 के अनुसरण में मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय (उच्चतर शिक्षा विभाग) के अन्तर्गत नवोदय विद्यालय समिति के अधीन जवाहर नवोदय विद्यालय, कानकोण, दक्षिण गोवा को, ऐसे कार्यालय के रूप में, जिसके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. 11011-7/2005-रा.भा.ए.]

केशव देसिराजु, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th July, 2007

S.O. 2218.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Canacona, South Goa under the Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti, under the Ministry of Human Resource Development, (Deptt. of School Education and Literacy) as office, whose more than 80% members of the Staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. 11011-7/2005-O.L.U.]

KESHAV DESIRAJU, Jt. Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2219.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 की उप-धारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् से परामर्श करने के बाद एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :-

उक्त प्रथम अनुसूची में "गुजरात विश्वविद्यालय" और उससे संबद्ध प्रविष्टियों के बाद "गुरु घासीराम विश्वविद्यालय, बिलासपुर, छत्तीसगढ़" जोड़ा जाएगा और "गुरु घासीदास विश्वविद्यालय, बिलासपुर, छत्तीसगढ़" के सामने, 'मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता' [(इसके बाद स्तंभ (2) के रूप में संदर्भित)] शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत और 'पंजीकरण के लिए संक्षेपण' [(इसके बाद स्तंभ (3) के रूप में संदर्भित)] शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा; अर्थात् :-

(2)	(3)
बैचलर ऑफ मेडिसिन	एम.बी.बी.एस.
एंड बैचलर ऑफ सर्जरी	(यह मान्यताप्राप्त आयुर्विज्ञान अर्हता होगी जब यह छत्तीसगढ़ आयुर्विज्ञान संस्थान, बिलासपुर, छत्तीसगढ़ में प्रशिक्षित किए जा रहे छात्रों के संबंध में गुरु घासीदास विश्वविद्यालय द्वारा मार्च, 2006 में अथवा उसके बाद प्रदान की गई हो।)

[सं. यू. 12012/72/2000-एम ई (पी-II)]

एस. के. मिश्रा, अव्वर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health and Family Welfare)

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2219.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of the Section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consulting the Medical Council of India, hereby makes

the following further amendments in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely :—

In the said First Schedule after "Gujarat University" and entries thereto "Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh" shall be added and against "Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh" under the heading 'Recognized Medical Qualification' [hereinafter referred to as column (2)], and under the heading "Abbreviation for Registration" [hereinafter referred to as column (3)], the following shall be inserted, namely :—

(2)	(3)
Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery	M.B.B.S. (This shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted on or after March, 2006 by Guru Ghasidas University in respect of students of being trained at Chhattisgarh Institute of Medical Sciences, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh).

[No. U. 12012/72/2000-ME (P-II)]

S. K. MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2220.—औषध एवं प्रशाधन सामग्री अधिनियम, 1940 (1940 का 23) की धारा 21 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार ने एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ :-

1. श्रीमती स्वाति श्रीवास्तव
2. श्री जयंत कुमार
3. श्री नरेश शर्मा

को समूचे भारत के लिए निरीक्षकों के रूप में नियुक्त किया है।

[सं. ए. 12015/1/2002-डी/डी.एफ.क्यू.सी.]

आशा थॉमस, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2007

S.O. 2220.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 21 of the Drugs and Cosmetic Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), the Central Government hereby appoints :—

1. Smt. Swati Srivastava
2. Shri Jayant Kumar
3. Shri Naresh Sharma

as Inspectors for the purpose of the said Act for the whole of India.

[No. A-12015/1/2002-D/DFQC]

ASHA THOMAS, Director


उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 2007

का. आ. 2221.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स डिवाइस कॉन रिसर्च सेन्टर, बरदोली नगर, तिनसुकिया, असम-786 125 द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग-III) "एन ई पी-3" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "स्मार्ट वेट" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/06/77 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 2,000 कि.ग्रा. और न्यूनतम क्षमता 10 कि.ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अन्तराल (ई) का मान 500 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिवृत्ति मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित/परिवर्धित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे अनुमोदित मॉडल का निर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मान सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक और 5000 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान $1 \times 10^*$, $2 \times 10^*$ या $5 \times 10^*$, के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(353)/2004]

आर. माथुरबूधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION**(Department of Consumer Affairs)**


New Delhi, the 19th March, 2007

S.O. 2221.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Platform type) with digital indication of "NEP-3" series of medium accuracy (accuracy class-III) and with brand name "SMART WEIGHT" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Device Con Research Centre, Bordoloi Nagar, Tinsukia, Assam-786 125 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/06/77;

The said model (see the figure given above) is a strain gauge type load cell based weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 2000 kg. and minimum capacity of 10 kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 500 g. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.



Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity above 50kg and up to 5000 kg. with the number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g. or more and with 'e' value of the form 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(353)/2004]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 2007

का. आ. 2222,—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स बिजेरबा इंडिया प्राइवेट लि.; 27 एकर, प्रताप कोठारी कम्पाउंड, टिकू जिन्नी वाड़ी, मानपाड़ा, थाणे (वेस्ट)-400 607 द्वारा विनिर्मित एक्स-(1) यथार्थता वर्ग वाले "सी डब्ल्यू एम" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित कैच तोलन उपकरण (चैक वेयर प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "बिजेरबा" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/2007/243 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करती है।



उक्त मॉडल भार सेल आधारित स्वचालित तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 10 कि.ग्रा. है। अधिकतम आउटपुट 250 पैक्स प्रति मिनट है। बेल्ट की चौड़ाई 20 मि.मी. से 300 मि.मी. है। लिक्विड क्रिस्टल प्रदर्श (एल सी डी) तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(219)/2006]

आर. माथुरबूधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th June, 2007

S.O. 2222.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of the Automatic Catch Weighing Instrument (Check Weigher type) with digital indication of Accuracy class-X(1) and brand "BIZERBA" and series "CWM" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Bizerba India Private Limited, 27 Acre, Pratap Kothari Compound, Opposite Tiku Jinni Wadi, Manpada, Thane (West)-400 607, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/243;



The said model (see the figure given above) is a load cell based automatic catch weighing instrument with a maximum capacity upto 10 kg. The maximum output is 250 packs per minute. The belt width is 20 mm to 300mm. The Light Crystal Display (LCD) indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc.


[F. No. WM-21(219)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2223.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स डिवाइस कॉन रिसर्च सेंटर, बरदोलोई नगर, तिनसुकिया, असम-786 125 द्वारा विनिर्मित यथार्थता वर्ग-2 वाले “एस आर सी यू 100” शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित डिस्कटीन्यूअस टोटलाइजिंग ऑटोमेटिक तोलन उपकरण (टोटलाइजिंग हॉपर वेहयर) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम “स्मार्ट वेंट” है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/06/76 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृति गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अंकक सूचन सहित टोटलाइजिंग तोलन उपकरण है। अधिकतम संचालित गति पर इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 1800 कि.ग्रा. प्रति घंटा है। मापमान अन्तराल या परीक्षण सूचक 10 ग्रा. है। तोलन रेंज 1 कि.ग्रा. से 30 कि. ग्रा. है और गति रेंज 30 कि.ग्रा. प्रति मिनट तक है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्ट्रापिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित/परिवर्धित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे अनुमोदित मॉडल का निर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जिनकी अधिकतम क्षमता 100 कि.ग्रा. है।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(353)/2004]



आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2223.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of the Discontinuous Totalizing Automatic Weighing Instrument (Totalising Hopper Weigher) with digital indication of Accuracy class-2 and brand name "SMART WEIGHT" and series "SRCU 100" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Device Con Research Centre, Bordoloi Nagar, Tinsukia, Assam-786 125 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/06/76;

The said model (see the figure given below) is a load cell based totalizing weighing machine with digital indication. It has a maximum output of 1800 kg per hour at maximum operating speed. The scale interval or test indication is 10g. The weighing range is 1 kg to 30 kg and speed range is up to 30 kg per minute. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.



In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of the Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity upto 100 kg manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.



[F. No. WM-21(353)/2004]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2224.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स डिवाइस कौन रिसर्च सेन्टर, बरदोलोई नगर, तिनसुकिया, असम-786 125 द्वारा विनिर्मित उच्च यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग-II) "न्यू-2" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार के लिए कन्वर्शन किट) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "स्मार्ट वेट" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/06/78 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृति गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित तोलन उपकरण उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 2,000 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 5 कि.ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अन्तराल (ई) का मान 100 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित/परिवर्धित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे अनुमोदित मॉडल का निर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि.ग्रा. से 50 मि. ग्रा. तक "ई" मान के लिए 100 से 50,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) और 100 मि. ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 5000 से 50,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मान सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक और 5000 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिक क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान $1 \times 10^*$, $2 \times 10^*$ या $5 \times 10^*$, के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(353)/2004]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2224.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Conversion kit for Platform type) with digital indication of "NEW-2" series of high accuracy (accuracy class-II) and brand name "SMART WEIGHT" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Device Con Research Centre, Bordoloi Nagar, Tinsukia, Assam-786 125 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/06/78;

The said model (see the figure given below) is a strain gauge type load cell based weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 2000 kg and minimum capacity of 5 kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 100 g. It has a tare device with a 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.



In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity 50 kg and up to 5000 kg. with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 1 mg to 50 mg. and with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 5,000 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 100 mg or more and with 'e' value of the form 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.



[F. No. WM-21(353)/2004]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2225.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स डिवाइस कॉन रिसर्च सेंटर, बरदोलोई नगर, तिनसुकिया, असम-786125 द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग-III) "न्यू-3" श्रृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (वेब्रिज के लिए कन्वर्शन किट) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "स्मार्ट वेट" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/06/79 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृति गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 40,000 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 200 कि.ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अन्तराल (ई) का मान 10 कि.ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टैपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिवृत्ति मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित/परिवर्धित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे अनुमोदित मॉडल का निर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी श्रृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो विनिर्मित उसी श्रृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 5 कि.ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मान सहित 5 टन से 100 टन तक की अधिक क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^4 , 2×10^4 या 5×10^4 , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(353)/2004]


आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2225.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Conversion kit for Weigbridge type) with digital indication of "NEW-3" series of medium accuracy (accuracy class-III) and with brand name "SMART WEIGHT" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Device Con Research Centre, Bordoloi Nagar, Tinsukia, Assam-786 125 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/06/79;

The said model (see the figure given above) is a load cell based weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 40000 kg. and minimum capacity of 200 kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 10 kg. It has a tare device with a 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.



In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity above 5 tonnes and upto 100 tonne with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5kg or more and with 'e' value of the form 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(353)/2004]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 2007

का. अ. 2226.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नौसे की गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स एस. एस. अल्ट्रा हाई-टेक एसोसिएट, एफ-87, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, फेस-III, नई दिल्ली-110020, द्वारा विनिर्मित "3 एस-01" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित टैक्सी मीटर का मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "ट्रिनिटी" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन क्र. एन डी/09/06/550 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल अंकक सूचन सहित टैक्सी/आटो किराया मीटर है जो समय और दूरी नापने का उपकरण है। यह यात्रा के किसी भी क्षण यात्री द्वारा संदेय प्रसार को निरंतर जोड़ता रहता है और उपदर्शित करता रहता है। यात्रा के दौरान कतिपय विनिर्दिष्ट चाल से ऊपर और विनिर्दिष्ट चाल के नीचे चली गई दूरी के किराए को देय करने का फंक्शन है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) मीटर की रीडिंग उपदर्शित करता है "के" घटक 1680 पल्स/कि.मी. है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 6 वोल्ट प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(87)/2006]

आर. माधुरबुधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th July, 2007

S.O. 2226.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of Taximeter with digital indication of "Trinity" as trade name and with series "3S-01" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. SS-ULTRA Hi-Tech Associates, F-87, Okhla Industrial Estate, Phase III, New Delhi-110020 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/06/550;

The said model is a digital Auto Fare Meter/Taxi Meter which is a measuring device incorporated with gear system which totalizes continuously and indicate the fare at any moment of journey, the charges payable by the passenger as function of distance traveled below a certain speed and the length of time occupied, independent of the supplementary charges according to the authorized tariffs. The "K" factor is 1680 pulses per Kilometer.



The light emitting diode (LED) display indicates the measuring result. The instrument operates on 6 Volts direct current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.


[F. No. WM-21(87)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2227.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट तथा माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) और बाट तथा माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स सिटिजन स्केल (आई) प्रा. लि., 3, पुष्पांजली, गडशाला लेन, मलाड (ईस्ट), मुंबई-400097, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित विशेष यथार्थता वर्ग (यथार्थता वर्ग-1) वाले 'सी घाई-204' शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबलटॉप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम 'सिटिजन' है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/144 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक इलैक्ट्रोमेगनेटिक फोर्स कम्पेंसेशन (सिंगल ब्लॉक वे सेंसर) आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबलटॉप प्रकार) है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 220 ग्राम और न्यूनतम क्षमता 100 मि. ग्राम है। इसका सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल 1 मि. ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। तरल क्रिस्टल डिस्प्ले/वेक्यूम फ्लोरेसेंट डिस्प्ले तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉम्पिंग प्लेट को सील करने के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोले जाने से रोकने के लिए भी सीलबन्द किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पूर्व या उपरान्त इसके सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम वर्किंग सिद्धांत आदि के रूप में कोई परिवर्तन न किया जा सके।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से, जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि. ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 50,000 या उससे अधिक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 किलोग्राम तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^{-3} , 2×10^{-3} या 5×10^{-3} , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(235)/2006]

आर. माधुरबूधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th July, 2007

S.O. 2227.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with digital indication of Special accuracy (Accuracy class-I) of series "CY-204" and with brand name "CITIZEN" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Citizen Scale (I) Pvt. Ltd., 3, Pushpanjali, Gaushala Lane, Malad (East), Mumbai-400 097, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/144;



The said model is an electromagnetic force compensation (Single Block Weigh Sensor) based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with a maximum capacity of 220g and minimum capacity of 100 mg. The verification scale interval (e) is 1 mg. It has a tare device with a 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Liquid Crystal Display (LFD)/Vacuum Fluorescent Display (VED) indicates the weighing results. The instrument operates on 230 Volts, 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms, in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity up to 50kg with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 50,000 or above for 'e' value of 1mg. or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , where k is a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(235)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2228.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट तथा माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) और बाट तथा माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उद्देश्यों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स सिटिजन स्कैल (आई) प्रा. लि. 3, मुम्बाईली, गठरात्मलेम, मलाह (ईस्ट), मुंबई-400097, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित विशेष (यथार्थता वर्ग-1) वाले 'सी सी-2202' मॉडल को अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबल टॉप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम 'सिटिजन' है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/145 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक इलेक्ट्रोमेगनेटिक फोर्स कम्पेंसेशन (सिंगल ब्लॉक वे सेंसर) आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबल टॉप प्रकार) है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 2202 ग्राम और न्यूनतम क्षमता 10 ग्राम है। इसका सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल 10 मि. ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यकलात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। तरल क्रिस्टल डिस्प्ले/वेक्यूम फ्लोरेसेंट डिस्प्ले के तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत पर कार्य करता है।

स्टम्पिंग प्लेट को सील करने के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोले जाने से रोकने के लिए भी सीलबन्द किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पूर्व या उपरांत इसके सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम, वकिंग सिद्धांत आदि के रूप में कोई परिवर्तन न किया जा सके।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाणपत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माण द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से, जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी मॉडल के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि. ग्राम या उससे अधिक के "इ" मान के लिए 50,000 या उससे अधिक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 किलोग्राम तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "इ" मान 1×10^{-6} , 2×10^{-6} या 5×10^{-6} के हैं, जो घनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(235)/2006]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th July, 2007

S.O. 2228.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with digital indication of Special accuracy (Accuracy class-I) of series "CG-2202" and with brand name "CITIZEN" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Citizen Scale (I) Pvt. Ltd., 3, Pushpanjali, Gaushala Lane, Malad (East), Mumbai-400 097, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/145;



The said model is an electromagnetic force compensation (Single Block Weigh Sensor) based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with a maximum capacity of 2202g and minimum capacity of 10g. The verification scale interval (e) is 10 mg. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Liquid Crystal Display (LCD)/ Vacuum Fluorescent Display (VFD) indicates the weighing results. The instrument operates on 230 Volts, 50 Hertz alternative current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms, in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity up to 50kg with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 50,000 or above for 'e' value of 1mg. or more with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , where k is a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(235)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2229.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स सिटिजन स्कैल (आई) प्रा. लि., 3, पुष्पांजली, गडशाला लेन, मलाड (ईस्ट), मुंबई-400097, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित विशेष यथार्थता वर्ग (यथार्थता वर्ग-I) वाले 'सी एक्स-220' शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबलटॉप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम 'सिटिजन' है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/146 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक इलेक्ट्रोमैग्नेटिक फोर्स कम्पेंसेशन (सिंगल ब्लॉक वे सेंसर) आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबल टॉप प्रकार) है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 220 ग्राम और न्यूनतम क्षमता 100 मि. ग्राम है। इसका सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल 1 मि. ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। तरल क्रिस्टल डिस्प्ले/वेक्यूम फ्लोरेसेंट डिस्प्ले तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉम्पिंग प्लेट को सील करने के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कष्टपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोले जाने से रोकने के लिए भी सीलबन्द किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पूर्व या उपरांत इसके सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम वकिंग सिद्धांत आदि के रूप में कोई परिवर्तन न किया जा सके।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाणपत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का निर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि. ग्राम या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 50,000 या उससे अधिक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 किलोग्राम तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^{-6} , 2×10^{-6} या 5×10^{-6} , 'के' हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(235)/2006]

आर. माधुरबूधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th July, 2007

S.O. 2229.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with digital indication of Special accuracy (Accuracy class-I) of series "CX-220" and with brand name "CITIZEN" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Citizen Scale (I) Pvt. Ltd., 3, Pushpanjali, Gaushala Lane, Malad (East) Mumbai-400 097, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/146;



The said model is an electromagnetic force compensation (Single Block Weigh Sensor) based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top Type) with a maximum capacity of 220g and minimum capacity of 100 mg. The verification scale interval (e) is 1mg. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Liquid Crystal Display (LCD)/ Vacuum Fluorescent Display VFD) indicates the weighing results. The instrument operates on 230 Volts, 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit-diagram, working principle etc., before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (12) of section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity up to 50kg. with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 50,000 or above for 'e' value of 1mg. or more with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , where 'k' is a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(235)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2230.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट तथा माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स सिटिजन स्कैल (आई) प्रा. लि. गाला नं. 8, स्वगत बिल्डिंग, सागर प्लाजा इण्डस्ट्रियल कॉम्प्लेक्स, भोईडपदा, वसई, सतिवली रोड, (ईस्ट), ठाणे-401208, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित उच्च यथार्थता वर्ग (यथार्थता वर्ग-II) वाले 'एस एस एच-92' शृंखला के अंकक सूचक सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम 'सिटिजन' है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/196 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक इलैक्ट्रोमेगनेटिक फोर्स कम्पेंसेशन (सिंगल ब्लॉक वे सेंसर) आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 50 किलो ग्राम और न्यूनतम क्षमता 50 ग्राम है। इसका सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल 1 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। तरल क्रिस्टल डिस्प्ले/वेक्यूम फ्लोरेसेंट डिस्प्ले तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती द्वारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टाम्पिंग प्लेट को सील करने के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोले जाने से रोकने के लिए भी सीलबन्द किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पूर्व या उपरांत इसके सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम वकिंग सिद्धांत आदि के रूप में कोई परिवर्तन न किया जा सके।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाणपत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि. ग्राम से 50 मि. ग्राम के "ई" मान के लिए 100 से 1,00,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) और 100 मि. ग्राम या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 5,000 से 1,00,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 किलोग्राम से 5000 कि. ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान $1 \times 10^*$, $2 \times 10^*$ या $5 \times 10^*$, 'के' हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(235)/2006]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th July, 2007

S.O. 2230.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Platform type) with digital indication of High accuracy (Accuracy class-II) of series "SSH-92" and with brand name "CITIZEN" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Citizen Scale (I) Pvt., Ltd., Gala No. 8, Swagat Building, Sagar Plaza Industrial Complex, Bhoidapada, Vasai, Sativali Road, Vasai (East) Thane-401208, and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/196;



The said model is an electromagnetic force compensation based non-automatic weighing instrument (Platform type) with a maximum capacity of 50kg and minimum capacity of 50g. The verification scale interval (e) is 1g. It has a tare device with a 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Liquid Crystal Display (LCD)/ Vacuum Fluorescent Display (VFD) indicates the weighing results. The instrument operates on 230 Volts, 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc.

Further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity above 50kg. and up to 5,000 kg. with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 1,00,000 for 'e' value of 1mg. to 50 mg. and with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 5,000 to 1,00,000 for 'e' value of 100 mg. or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , where 'k' is a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.

[F. No. WM-21(235)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2231.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) और बाट तथा माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स सिटिजन स्केल (आई) प्रा. लि, गाला नं. 8, स्वागत बिल्डिंग, सागर प्लाज़ा इण्डस्ट्रियल कॉम्प्लेक्स, भोईडपदा, वसई, सतिवली रोड, वसई (ईस्ट), ठाणे-401208, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित उच्च यथार्थता वर्ग (यथार्थता वर्ग-1) वाले 'एस एस एच-94' शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबलटॉप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम 'सिटिजन' है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/195 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक इलैक्ट्रोमैग्नेटिक फोर्स कम्पेंसेशन (सिंगल ब्लॉक वे सेंसर) आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबल टॉप प्रकार) है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 20 किलो ग्राम और न्यूनतम क्षमता 10 ग्राम है। इसका सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल 100 मि. ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। तरल क्रिस्टल डिस्प्ले/वेक्यूम फ्लोरेसेंट डिस्प्ले तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टैमिंग प्लेट को सील करने के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोले जाने से रोकने के लिए भी सीलबन्द क्रिया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पूर्व या उपरान्त इसके सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम वकिंग सिद्धांत आदि के रूप में कोई परिवर्तन न किया जा सके।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाणपत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि. ग्राम या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 50,000 या उससे अधिक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 किलोग्राम तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^{-3} , 2×10^{-3} या 5×10^{-3} के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(235)/2006]

आर. माधुराधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 26th July, 2007

S.O. 2231.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with digital indication of Special accuracy (Accuracy class-I) of series "SSH-94" and with brand name "CITIZEN" (hereinafter referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Citizen Scale (I) Pvt., Ltd., Gala No. 8, Swagat Building, Sagar Plaza Industrial Complex, Bhoidapada, Vasai, Sativali Road, Vasai (East) Thane-401208, and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/95;



The said model is an electromagnetic force compensation based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with a maximum capacity of 20kg and minimum capacity of 10g. The verification scale interval (e) is 100mg. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Liquid Crystal Display (LCD)/Vacuum Fluorescent Display (VFD) indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts, 50 Hertz alternative current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity up to 50kg with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 50,000 or above for 'e' value of 1mg. or more with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , where k is a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.

[F. No. WM-21(235)/2006]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2232.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 2980 दिनांक 17 नवम्बर, 2004 तथा का.आ. 625 दिनांक 1 मार्च, 2007 का आंशिक अशोधन करते हुए, दिल्ली राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र तथा हरियाणा, उत्तर प्रदेश और राजस्थान राज्यों के राज्य क्षेत्र के भीतर, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन, मांगल्या (इन्दौर) से पियाला/बिजवासन तक भारत पेट्रोलियम कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड (बीपीसीएल) की मुम्बई-मांगल्या पाइपलाइन विस्तार परियोजना के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिए श्रीमति भगवती जेठवानी, उप महानिरीक्षक, पंजीयन एवं मुद्रांक, कोटा, राजस्थान सरकार, को प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फाइल सं. आर-31015/8/2004-ओ आर-II]

ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2007

S.O. 2232.—In partial modification of notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas No. S.O. 2980 dated the 17th November, 2004 and S.O. No. 625 dated the 1st March, 2007 and in pursuance of Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of user in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government hereby authorises Smt. Bhagwanti Jethwani, Deputy Inspector General, Stamps and Registration, Kota, Government of Rajasthan on deputation to Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL), to perform the functions of the Competent Authority for BPCL's Mumbai-Manglya Pipeline Extension Project from Manglya (Indore) to Piyala/Bijwasan, under the said Act, within the territory of NCT of Delhi and States of Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan.

[File No. R-31015/8/2004-OR-II]

A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2233.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. और तारीख की नीचे दी गई अनुसूची में यथादिल्लेखित तारीख की अधिसूचना का. आ. संख्या द्वारा उन अधिसूचनाओं से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि के अधिकार के अर्जन का अधिकार प्राप्त किया था।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त भूमियों में जो सभी विल्लंगनों से मुक्त हैं, उपयोग का अधिकार, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित किया था।

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दी है कि सिद्धपुर (गुजरात राज्य) से सांगानेर (राजस्थान राज्य) तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के प्रयोजन के लिए राजस्थान राज्य के अनुसूची में उक्त तहसील फागी, जिला जयपुर तहसील मालपुरा, जिला टोंक तहसील किशनगढ़, नसीराबाद, पोसांगन, मसूदा, ब्यावर, जिला अजमेर तहसील रायपुर, सोजत, देसुरी, खारची, बाली जिला पाली, तहसील पिण्डवाड़ा, आबूरोड़ जिला सिरोही तहसील के ग्रामों की भूमियों में पाइपलाइन बिछाई जा चुकी है। अतः इन भूमियों में प्रचालन की समाप्ति की जाए जिसका संक्षिप्त विवरण इस अधिसूचना की संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट किया जाता है।

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) नियम, 1963 के नियम 4, के स्पष्टीकरण-1 के अधीन अपेक्षागुसार उक्त अनुसूची के स्तंभ 7 में उल्लिखित तारीख की प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीखों के रूप में घोषित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्र. सं.	धारा 6 (1) की का. आ. सं. एवं दिनांक	ग्राम का नाम	तहसील	जिला	राज्य	प्रचालन की समाप्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	2882 दिनांक 10-9-02	कँवरपुरा	फागी	जयपुर	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	542 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	543 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2882 दिनांक 10-9-02	कैरिया				3-6-2005
	542 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	543 दिनांक 13-2-03					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	2882 दिनांक 10-9-02	मैदवास	फागी	जयपुर	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	542 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	543 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2882 दिनांक 10-9-02	माँदी				3-6-2005
	2882 दिनांक 10-9-02	निमेडा				3-6-2005
	542 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	543 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2882 दिनांक 10-9-02	रतनपुरा				3-6-2005
2.	622 दिनांक 17-2-03	बरोल	मालपुरा	टोंक		3-6-2005
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	कुराड़				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	मलिकपुर				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	किरावल				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	पचेवर				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	स्याह				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	डेठाणी				3-6-2005
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	चांबडिया				3-6-2005
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	अरनिया				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03	बस्सी				
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	आंटोली				3-6-2005
	622 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	623 दिनांक 17-2-03					
	1610 दिनांक 28-5-03					
	2617 दिनांक 13-8-02	लडी	मालपुरा	टोंक	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	ढसूक	किशनगढ़	अजमेर		3-6-2005
	774 दिनांक 6-3-03					
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	मंडियावड				3-6-2005
		खुर्द				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	मडियावड	किशनगढ़	अजमेर	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	774 दिनांक 6-3-03	कलां				
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	मोठी				3-6-2005
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	झिरोता				3-6-2005
	774 दिनांक 6-3-03					
	775 दिनांक 6-3-03					
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	जोरावरपुरा				3-6-2005
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	आकोडिया				3-6-2005
	2482 दिनांक 24-7-02	गोटियाना				3-6-2005
	774 दिनांक 6-3-03					
	774 दिनांक 6-3-03					
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	धोलादांता (देरादू)	नसीराबाद			3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	बाघसूरी				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	बुबानिया				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	बनेवडा				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	मावसिया				3-6-2005
	207 दिनांक 9-1-03					
	208 दिनांक 9-1-03					
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	मोतीपुरा				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	रामसर				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	सनोद				3-6-2005
	208 दिनांक 9-1-03					
	1735 दिनांक 23-7-04					
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	सूरजपुरा				3-6-2005
	207 दिनांक 9-1-03					
	208 दिनांक 9-1-03					
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	धोलादांता (बुबानिया)				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	देरादू				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	चाट				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	जगपुरा				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	नेपोली				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	अजबा का बाडिया				3-6-2005
	2622 दिनांक 16-8-02	अन्सरी	नसीराबाद	अजमेर	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	1589 दिनांक 7-5-02	रूदलाई	पिसांगन			3-6-2005
	1589 दिनांक 7-5-02	बिड़कच्यावास				3-6-2005

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	1589 दिनांक 7-5-02	अमरगढ़	नसीरुबाद लिसांगन	अजमेर	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	1589 दिनांक 7-5-02	लीडी	पिसांगन			3-6-2005
	3539 दिनांक 8-11-02					3-6-2005
6	1731 दिनांक 24-5-02	खरवा	मसूदा			3-6-2005
	1731 दिनांक 24-5-02	कानाखेड़ा				3-6-2005
	1731 दिनांक 24-5-02	केशरपुरा				3-6-2005
	1731 दिनांक 24-5-02	नासून				3-6-2005
7	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	बाडिया श्यामा	ब्यावर			3-6-2005
	1741 दिनांक 23-7-04					
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	बाडिया जग्गा				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	गढी थोरियान				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	सेंसपुरा				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	लसाडिया				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	लसानी-1				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	मान्डावास				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	सुहावा				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	लाखीना				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	जालिया-1				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	शिवनाथपुरा				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	भोजपुरा				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	केशरपुरा (परसा)				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	नून्दरी-मालदेव				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	सेदरिया				3-6-2005
	1594 दिनांक 7-5-02	बलाड				3-6-2005
8	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	सबलपुरा	रायपुर	पाली		3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	धोलिया				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	खीवल				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	झालाकी चौकी				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	बर				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	माकडवाली				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	मोहराखुर्द				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	मेगडदा				3-6-2005

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	रायपुर-II				3-6-2005
	3060 दिनांक 23-10-03					
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	सबलपुरा				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	सराधना				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	सेन्दडा	रायपुर	पाली	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	दीपावास				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	चावडियाखुर्द				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	फत्ताखेडा				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	जैतपुरा				3-6-2005
	1587 दिनांक 7-5-02	लवाचा				3-6-2005
9	1588 दिनांक 7-5-02	बगडी	सोजत			3-6-2005
	1588 दिनांक 7-5-02	पीपलाद				3-6-2005
	3061 दिनांक 23-10-03					
	1588 दिनांक 7-5-02	केलवाद				3-6-2005
	1588 दिनांक 7-5-02	देवली हुल्ला				3-6-2005
	1588 दिनांक 7-5-02	सिंगपुरा				3-6-2005
	1588 दिनांक 7-5-02	रायरा कलाँ				3-6-2005
10	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	बडौद	देसूरी			3-6-2005
	2915 दिनांक 21-7-06					25-1-2007
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	उन्दरथल				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	पदमपुरा				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	ढालोप				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	कोटडी				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	नाडोल				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	गुढा-केसरसिंह				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	जीवन्दखुर्द				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	बोरडी				3-6-2005
	3610 दिनांक 14-11-02					
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	बोलाकुडा				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	घेनडी				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	पिलोवनी				3-6-2005
	3610 दिनांक 14-11-02					
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	सिवास				3-6-2005
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	गुढा दोलजी				3-6-2005
	3610 दिनांक 14-11-02					
	1593 दिनांक 7-5-02	खिवाड़ा				3-6-2005
11	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	देवली	खारची			3-6-2005
	3406 दिनांक 21-10-02					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	जैतपुरा				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	कादू				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	गुढा केसरसिंह				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	जाटियों की ढाणी	खारची	पाली	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	आंगदोष				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	रडावास				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	गादाणा				3-6-2005
	3406 दिनांक 21-10-02					
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	राणावास				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	बडी				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	गोपावास				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	निम्बली (मांडा)				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	मांडा				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	हमीरवास				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	राजोला खुर्द				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	कंटालिया				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	बोरनडी				3-6-2005
	1592 दिनांक 7-5-02	गुडांगरी				3-6-2005
12	2643 दिनांक 16-8-02	नाना	बाली			3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2643 दिनांक 16-8-02	चामुन्देरी				3-6-2005
	545 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2643 दिनांक 16-8-02	वीरमपुरा				3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	भन्दर				3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	545 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	कुमटिया				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	कोठार				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	बेडा				3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	भादून्द				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	बीजापुर				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	पादरला				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	सेवाडी				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	बारवा				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	पातावा				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	लुनावा				3-6-2005

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	सेसली				3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	पुनाडिया				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	कोट बालियान	बाली	पाली	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	सादलवा				3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	टीपरी				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	मुण्डारा				3-6-2005
	2623 दिनांक 16-8-02	भीटवाड़ा				3-6-2005
	544 दिनांक 13-2-03					
13	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	भारजा	पिण्डवाड़ा	सिरोही		3-6-2005
	546 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	547 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	भीमाना				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	वाटेरा				3-6-2005
	2913 दिनांक 21-7-06					2-2-2007
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	भोंवरी				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	धनारी				3-6-2005
	546 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	कोदरला				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	रामपुरा				3-6-2005
	547 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	बनास				3-6-2005
	547 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	घोडियावा				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	चवरली				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	अजारी				3-6-2005
	546 दिनांक 13-2-03					
	2913 दिनांक 21-7-06					2-2-2007
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	पिण्डवाड़ा				3-6-2005
	546 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	547 दिनांक 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2913 दिनांक 21-7-06					2-2-2007
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	झाडोली				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	सादलवा				3-6-2005
	2885 दिनांक 10-9-02	बाडा				3-6-2005

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	खारा	आबू रोड	सिरोही	राजस्थान	3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	आम्बा				3-6-2005
	709 दिनांक 20-2-03					3-6-2005
	710 दिनांक 20-2-03					25-1-2007
	2914 दिनांक 21-7-06					3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	चन्द्रावती	आबू रोड			3-6-2005
	709 दिनांक 20-2-03					
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	सियावा				3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	सांतपुर				3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	कुई				3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	तरतौली				3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	खडात				
	710 दिनांक 20-2-03					
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	ओड				3-6-2005
	709 दिनांक 20-2-03					
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	मोरथला				3-6-2005
	2763 दिनांक 28-8-02	किवरली				3-6-2005
	710 दिनांक 20-2-03					

[फा. सं. आर-25011/6/2007-ओ. आर-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th August, 2007

S.O. 2233—Whereas, by the notifications of the Government of India in the ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, S.O. Number and date as mentioned in the schedule below issued under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government acquired the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to those notification;

And whereas, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government vested the right of user in said lands, free from all encumbrances, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas, the Competent Authority has made a report to the Central Government that the pipeline for the purpose of transport of petroleum products from Sidhpur in the state of Gujarat to Sanganer in the State of Rajasthan through the Villages in Tehsil Phagi District JAIPUR, Tehsil Malpura District TONK, Tehsil Kishangarh, Nasirabad, Pisangan, Masuda, Beawar, District AJMER, Tehsil Raipur, Sojat, Desuri, Kharchi, Bali District PALLI, Tehsil Pindwara, Abu-Road District SIROHI Tehsil in the State of Rajasthan mentioned in the schedule has been laid in the said lands, so the operation may be terminated in respect of the ROW (Right of Way) in land, description of which in brief is specified in the schedule annexed to this notification.

Now therefore, as required under explanation—1 of rule 4 the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) rules, 1963 the Central Government hereby declares the dated mentioned in Column 7 of the said Schedule as the dates of termination of operation.

Sl. No.	S.O. No. & Date of Under sub-section (1) of Section 6	Name of Village	Tehsil	District	State	Closing date
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	2882 Date 10-9-02 542 Date 13-2-03 543 Date 13-2-03	Kanwarpura	Phagi	Jaipur	Rajasthan	3-6-2005
1.	2882 Date 10-9-02	Keria				3-6-2005

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	2882 Date 10-9-02	Maindwad				3-6-2005
	542 Date 13-2-03					
	543 Date 13-2-03					
	2882 Date 10-9-02	Mandi				3-6-2005
	2882 Date 10-9-02	Nimeria				3-6-2005
	542 Date 13-2-03					
	543 Date 13-2-03					
	2882 Date 10-9-02	Ratanpura				3-6-2005
2.	622 Date 17-2-03	Barol	Malpura	Tonk		3-6-2005
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Kurar				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Malikpur				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Kirawal				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Pachewar				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Syah				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Dethani				3-6-2005
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Chawandiya				3-6-2005
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Arniya Bassi				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Antoli				3-6-2005
	622 Date 17-2-03					
	623 Date 17-2-03					
	1610 Date 28-5-03					
	2617 Date 13-8-02	Ladi				3-6-2005
3.	2482 Date 24-7-02	Dhasuk	Kishangarh	Ajmer		3-6-2005
	774 Date 6-3-03					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Mandiyawar Khurd				3-6-2005
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Mandiyawar Kala				3-6-2005
	774 Date 6-3-03					
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Mothi	Kishangarh	Ajmer	Rajasthan	3-6-2005
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Zirota				3-6-2005
	774 Date 6-3-03					
	775 Date 6-3-03					
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Jorawarpua				3-6-2005
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Akodiya				3-6-2005
	2482 Date 24-7-02	Gothiyana				3-6-2005
	774 Date 6-3-03					
	775 Date 6-3-03					
4.	2622 Date 16-8-02	Dhola Danta (Derathoo)	Nasirabad			3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Baghsuri				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Bubaniya				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Banewara				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Mawshiya				3-6-2005
	207 Date 9-1-03					
	208 Date 9-1-03					
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Motipura				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Ramsar				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Sanod				3-6-2005
	208 Date 9-1-03					
	1735 Date 23-7-04					
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Surajpura				3-6-2005
	207 Date 9-1-03					
	208 Date 9-1-03					
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Dholadanta (Bubaniya)				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Derathoo				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Chat				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Jagpura				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Nepoli				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Ajba-Ka Bariya				3-6-2005
	2622 Date 16-8-02	Ansari				3-6-2005

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
5.	1589 Date 7-5-02	Rudlai	Pisangan			3-6-2005
	1589 Date 7-5-02	Bidakchiyaw-				3-6-2005
		as				
	1589 Date 7-5-02	Amargarh				3-6-2005
	1589 Date 7-5-02	Leeri				3-6-2005
	3539 Date 8-11-02					3-6-2005
6.	1731 Date 24-5-02	Kharwa	Masuda			3-6-2005
	1731 Date 24-5-02	Kanakhera				3-6-2005
	1731 Date 24-5-02	Kesharpura				3-6-2005
	1731 Date 24-5-02	Nasoon				3-6-2005
7	1594 Date 7-5-02	Badiya	Beawar			3-6-2005
	1741 Date 23-7-04	Shyama				
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Badiya				3-6-2005
		Jagga				
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Garhi				3-6-2005
		Thoriyan				
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Senspura				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Lasariya				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Lasani-I	Beawar	Ajmer	Rajasthan	3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Mandawas				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Suhawa				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Lakheena				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Jaliya-I				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Shivnathpur-A				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Bhojpura				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Kesharpura				3-6-2005
		(Parsa)				
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Noondri-				3-6-2005
		Maldeo				
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Sedariya				3-6-2005
	1594 Date 7-5-02	Balar				3-6-2005
8.	1587 Date 7-5-02	Sabalpura	Raipur	Pali		3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Dholiya				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Khival				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Jhalya Ki-				3-6-2005
		Chowki				
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Bar				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Makarwali				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Mohra-				3-6-2005
		Khurd				
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Megarda				3-6-2005

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Raipur-II				3-6-2005
	3060 Date 23-10-03					
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Sabalpura				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Saradhana				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Deepawas				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Chawandiya				3-6-2005
		Khurd				
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Falta Khera				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Jaitpura				3-6-2005
	1587 Date 7-5-02	Lawacha				3-6-2005
9.	1588 Date 7-5-02	Bagri	Sojat			3-6-2005
	1588 Date 7-5-02	Piplad				3-6-2005
	3061 Date 23-10-03					
	1588 Date 7-5-02	Kelwad				3-6-2005
	1588 Date 7-5-02	Deolihulla				3-6-2005
	1588 Date 7-5-02	Singpura				3-6-2005
	1588 Date 7-5-02	Rayrakala				3-6-2005
10.	1593 Date 7-5-02	Barod	Desuri			3-6-2005
	2915 Date 21-7-06					25-1-2007
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Undarthal				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Padampura				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Dhalop				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Kotadi				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Nadol				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Gura Kesar-Singh				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Jiwand-Khurd	Desuri	Pali	Rajasthan	3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Bordi				3-6-2005
	3610 Date 14-11-02					
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Bolakura				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Ghenri				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Pilowani				3-6-2005
	3610 Date 14-11-02					
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Siwas				3-6-2005
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Guru Dolji				3-6-2005
	3610 Date 14-11-02					
	1593 Date 7-5-02	Khiwara				3-6-2005
11.	1592 Date 7-5-02	Deoli	Kharchi			3-6-2005
	3406 Date 21-10-02	Jetpura				
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Kadu				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Gura-Keshar-Singh				3-6-2005
						3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Jatyon Ki-Dhani				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Angdosh				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Radawas				3-6-2005

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Gadana				3-6-2005
	3406 Date 21-10-02					
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Ranawas				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Bari				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Gopawas				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Nimbli (Manda)				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Manda				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Hameerwas				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Rajolakhurd				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Kantaliya				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Bornadi				3-6-2005
	1592 Date 7-5-02	Gudangari				3-6-2005
12.	2623 Date 16-8-02	Nana	Bali			3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Chamunderi				3-6-2005
	545 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Virampura				3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Bhandar				3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	545 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Kumtiya				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Kothar				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Bera				3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Bhatoond				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Beejapur	Pali			3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Padarla			Rajasthan	3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Sewari				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Barwa				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Patawa				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Lunawa	Bali			3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Sesli				3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Punadiya				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Kotbaliyan				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Sadalwa				3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Teepri				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Mundara				3-6-2005
	2623 Date 16-8-02	Bheetwara				3-6-2005
	544 Date 13-2-03					
13.	2885 Date 10-9-02	Bharja	Pindwara	Sirohi		3-6-2005
	546 Date 13-2-03					
	547 Date 13-2-03					
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Bhimana				3-6-2005

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Vatera				3-6-20005
	2913 Date 21-7-06					2-2-2007
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Bhawri				3-6-2005
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Dhanari				3-6-2005
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Kodarla				3-6-2005
	546 Date 13-2-03					
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Rampura				3-6-2005
	547 Date 13-2-03					
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Banas				3-6-2005
	547 Date 13-2-03					
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Ghodiya				3-6-2005
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Chawarli				3-6-2005
	546 Date 13-2-03					
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Ajari				3-6-2005
	2913 Date 21-7-06					2-2-2007
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Pindwara				3-6-2005
	546 Date 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	547 Date 13-2-03					3-6-2005
	2913 Date 21-7-06					2-2-2007
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Jhadoli				3-6-2005
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Sadalwa				3-6-2005
	2885 Date 10-9-02	Vada				3-6-2005
14.	2763 Date 28-8-02	Khara	Abu-			3-6-2005
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Amba	Road			3-6-2005
	709 Date 20-2-03					3-6-2005
	710 Date 20-2-03					3-6-2005
	2914 Date 21-7-06					25-1-2007
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Chandrawati				3-6-2005
	709 Date 20-2-03					
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Siyawa				3-6-2005
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Santpur	Abu-	Sirohi		3-6-2005
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Kui	Road		Rajasthan	3-6-2005
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Tartoli				3-6-2005
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Khadat				3-6-2005
	710 Date 20-2-03					
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Ode				3-6-2005
	709 Date 20-2-03					
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Morthala				3-6-2005
	2763 Date 28-8-02	Kiwarli				3-6-2005
	710 Date 20-2-03					

[File No. R-25011/6/2007-OR-I]

S. K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2234.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का. आ. 924 दिनांक 29 मार्च 2007 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, पारादीप-हल्दिया पाइपलाइन परियोजना हेतु कच्चे तेल परिवहन करने के प्रयोजन के लिये उड़ीसा राज्य के पारादीप से पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य के हल्दिया तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने हेतु संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट जिला: भद्रक, उड़ीसा की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को ता.07.06.2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी।

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, और सभी उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संबन्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने हेतु अर्जित किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है की उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त हो कर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिल्हा : भद्रक

राज्य : उडिसा

तहसील का नाम	गाँव का नाम	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
चान्दबाली	कान्डीआसाही	297	00	00	45
		1054	00	02	75
		307	00	06	02
		309	00	08	85
		291	00	03	43
		342	00	05	10
	डिओबिल	33	00	00	35
		32	00	04	35
	मुल्काईमा	376	00	07	20
		372	00	05	20
		373	00	03	50
		534	00	01	92
		525	00	01	04
		790	00	01	02
		528	00	03	93
		1899	00	04	31
		146	00	02	15
		3132	00	00	80
	माधापुर	3123	00	01	58
		3126	00	03	22
		3107	00	02	05
		3133	00	03	17
		3124	00	01	40
		1736	00	10	38
		5000	00	05	44
		2114	00	03	75
		2516	00	01	80
		2515	00	01	44

1	2	3	4	5	6
		4767	00	13	50
		4753	00	07	64
		3217	00	07	06
		3129	00	03	20
		3003	00	00	72
		2800	00	02	77
		2514	00	05	76
		2529	00	02	78
		2427	00	08	72
		2124	00	08	94
		1918	00	02	37
		1921	00	02	58
		265	00	08	55
	सान्तरापुर	1144/1767	00	11	29
		1671	00	01	45
		1669	00	02	79
तिहीडी	भानूपुर	194	00	00	44
	कान्हूपुर	412	00	01	00
		404	00	00	80
		358	00	00	86
	समंडकपुर	29	00	00	25
	कबीरपुर	1194	00	00	38
		1115	00	01	57
	जाफराबाद	527	00	00	15
		526	00	09	89
		513	00	02	39
		483	00	01	25
		482	00	01	10
		327	00	00	48
		479	00	05	44
		521	00	02	80
	नहुनीपाल	268	00	06	74
		263	00	02	85
		266	00	04	17
		262	00	03	62
		234	00	01	05
		162	00	13	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
		168	00	00	10
		167	00	15	80
		166	00	13	71
		264	00	05	73
		34	00	01	39
बासुदेवपुर	बागदाबिनायकपुर	1643	00	01	33
	साबरपुर	140	00	01	18
	सुंगुडा	695	00	08	55
	गुआगन	910	00	09	18
	सुआन	1655	00	02	10
		1570	00	01	82
	अरतुंग	132	00	00	31
		122	00	01	41
		85	00	00	70

[फा. सं. आर-25011/11/2004-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th August, 2007.

S. O. 2234.— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide S.O No. 924 dated 29.03.2007 issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Crude Oil from Paradip in the State of Orissa to Haldia in the State of West Bengal by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for its Paradip-Haldia Crude Oil Pipeline Project.

And whereas, copies of the said notification were made available to the general public on 07.06.2007.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied, that, the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this Notification should be acquired.

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6, Central Government hereby directs the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest, on the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

Schedule

District : Bhadrak

State : Orissa

Name of Tehsil	Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Chandbali	Kandiasahi	297	00	00	45
		1054	00	02	75
		307	00	06	02
		309	00	08	85
		291	00	03	43
		342	00	05	10
	Deobil	33	00	00	35
		32	00	04	35
	Mulkaema	376	00	07	20
		372	00	05	20
		373	00	03	50
		534	00	01	92
		525	00	01	04
		790	00	01	02
	Sansingpur	528	00	03	93
		1899	00	04	31
		146	00	02	15
	Barasingpur	3132	00	00	80
		3123	00	01	58
	Madhapur	3126	00	03	22
		3107	00	02	05
		3133	00	03	17
		3124	00	01	40
	Ghatpur	1736	00	10	38
		5000	00	05	44
		2114	00	03	75
		2516	00	01	80
		2515	00	01	44
		4767	00	13	50

1	2	3	4	5	6
		4753	00	07	64
		3217	00	07	06
		3129	00	03	20
		3003	00	00	72
		2800	00	02	77
		2514	00	05	76
		2529	00	02	78
		2427	00	08	72
		2124	00	08	94
		1918	00	02	37
		1921	00	02	58
		265	00	08	55
	Santarapur	1144/1767	00	11	29
		1671	00	01	45
		1669	00	02	79
Tihidi	Bhanupur	194	00	00	44
	Kanhupur	412	00	01	00
		404	00	00	80
		358	00	00	86
	Sandakpur	29	00	00	25
	Kabirpur	1194	00	00	38
		1115	00	01	57
	Jafrabad	527	00	00	15
		526	00	09	89
		513	00	02	39
		483	00	01	25
		482	00	01	10
		327	00	00	48
		479	00	05	44
		521	00	02	80
	Nahunipal	268	00	06	74
		263	00	02	85
		266	00	04	17
		262	00	03	62

1	2	3	4	5	6
		234	00	01	05
		162	00	13	61
		168	00	00	10
		167	00	15	80
		166	00	13	71
		264	00	05	73
		34	00	01	39
Basudevpur	Bagdabinayakpur	1643	00	01	33
	Sabarpur	140	00	01	18
	Sungura	695	00	08	55
	Guagan	910	00	09	18
	Suan	1655	00	02	10
		1570	00	01	82
	Artung	132	00	00	31
		122	00	01	41
		85	00	00	70

[F. No. R-25011/11/2004-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 2007

का.अ. 2235.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का. अ. 922 दिनांक 29 मार्च 2007 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, पारादीप-हल्दिया पाइपलाइन परियोजना हेतु कच्चे तेल परिवहन करने के प्रयोजन के लिये उड़ीसा राज्य के पारादीप से पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य के हल्दिया तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने हेतु संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट जिला: केंद्रपाड़ा, उड़ीसा की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।
और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को ता.05.06.2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी।

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, और सभी उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संबन्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने हेतु अर्जित किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है की उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त हो कर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिल्हा : केद्रपाडा

राज्य : उडिसा

तहसील का नाम	गाँव का नाम	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
महाकालपाडा	मलाडीहि	763	00	09	20
		762	00	09	54
	बरडंग	497	00	03	35
		1425	00	03	40
		508	00	00	80
		528	00	01	40
		529	00	00	30
		496	00	02	45
	खोलानई	235	00	01	00
	बंधपाडा	52/367	00	13	42
पटामुन्डाई	बाटिपाडा	407	00	02	74
	सतकुडिया	761	00	08	82
	चेडिया	566	00	08	02
	बुहाळ	101	00	02	68
		798	00	00	79
		52	00	01	80
		29	00	08	67
		459	00	03	60
		462	00	03	60
		463	00	08	82
		50	00	03	78
		439	00	02	66

	1	2	3	4	5	6
औल	बन्तो	61	00	02	99	
		1271	00	00	48	
		14	00	00	26	
	अन्धारूआ	18	00	06	71	
		19	00	04	87	
		20	00	07	71	
	मालीपुर	1580	00	00	21	
		1588	00	10	37	
	डामरपुर	2436	00	01	50	
		2424	00	00	18	
	पालपाटना	2683	00	05	25	
	अलिहा	399	00	01	30	
		704	00	01	69	
		857	00	02	68	
	मोहासानी	2387	00	06	76	
		1247/2765	00	04	00	
		2580	00	03	03	
		2414	00	08	24	
		1215	00	00	40	
		1138	00	03	60	
		990	00	00	40	
		1226/2771	00	00	70	
		2415	00	01	40	
		2517	00	00	98	
		2514	00	00	25	
		2417	00	06	31	
		2402	00	03	55	
		2572	00	00	68	
		2570	00	03	79	
		2885	00	01	81	
		2925	00	00	91	
		2224	00	00	72	
		1249	00	01	60	
		1227	00	01	02	
		1140	00	00	28	
		1216	00	08	51	
	चन्डियागड़ी	532	00	05	50	
	शितलेश्वर	795	00	05	30	

1	2	3	4	5	6
		77	00	01	08
	नियाल	1459	00	01	03
		2456	00	11	99
	तुन्गा	1846	00	01	46
		1864	00	00	18
		1410	00	00	65
		1371	00	02	61
		1710	00	10	60
		1711	00	05	65
		1712	00	01	05
		1723	00	06	65
		1081	00	01	26
		906	00	28	44
		647	00	01	02
		1448	00	09	81
		1449/1537	00	01	17
		646	00	01	12

[फा. सं. आर-25011/12/2004-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th August, 2007

S. O. 2235.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide S.O. No. 922 dated 29.03.2007 issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Crude Oil from Paradip in the State of Orissa to Haldia in the State of West Bengal by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for its Paradip-Haldia Crude Oil Pipeline Project.

And whereas, copies of the said notification were made available to the general public on 05.06.2007.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied, that, the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this Notifications should be acquired.

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6, Central Government hereby directs the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest, on the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

Schedule

District : Kendrapara

State : Orissa

Name of Tehsil	Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Mahakalpada	Maladihi	763	00	09	20
		762	00	09	54
	Baradang	497	00	03	35
		1425	00	03	40
		508	00	00	80
		528	00	01	40
		529	00	00	30
		496	00	02	45
	Kholanal	235	00	01	00
	Bandhapara	52/367	00	13	42
Pattamunda	Batipara	407	00	02	74
	Satkudja	761	00	08	82
	Chadeya	566	00	08	02
	Buhai	101	00	02	68
		798	00	00	79
		52	00	01	80
		29	00	08	67
		459	00	03	60
		462	00	03	60
		463	00	08	82
		50	00	03	78
		439	00	02	66

1	2	3	4	5	6
Aul	Banto	61	00	02	99
		1271	00	00	48
		14	00	00	26
	Andharua	18	00	06	71
		19	00	04	87
		20	00	07	71
	Malipur	1580	00	00	21
		1588	00	10	37
	Damarpur	2436	00	01	50
		2424	00	00	18
	Palpatna	2683	00	05	25
	Aliha	399	00	01	30
		704	00	01	69
		857	00	02	68
	Mahasani	2387	00	06	76
		1247/2765	00	04	00
		2580	00	03	03
		2414	00	08	24
		1215	00	00	40
		1138	00	03	60
		990	00	00	40
		1226/2771	00	00	70
		2415	00	01	40
		2517	00	00	98
		2514	00	00	25
		2417	00	06	31
		2402	00	03	55
		2572	00	00	68
		2570	00	03	79
		2885	00	01	81
		2925	00	00	91
		2224	00	00	72
		1249	00	01	60
		1227	00	01	02

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1140	00	00	28
		1216	00	08	51
	Chandiagadi	532	00	05	50
	Sitleswar	795	00	05	30
		77	00	01	08
	Nial	1459	00	01	03
		2456	00	11	99
	Tunga	1846	00	01	46
		1864	00	00	18
		1410	00	00	65
		1371	00	02	61
		1710	00	10	60
		1711	00	05	65
		1712	00	01	05
		1723	00	06	65
		1081	00	01	26
		906	00	28	44
		647	00	01	02
		1448	00	09	81
		1449/1537	00	01	17
		646	00	01	12

[F. No. R-25011/12/2004-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2236.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का. आ. 925 दिनांक 29 मार्च 2007 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, पारादीप-हल्दिया पाइपलाइन परियोजना हेतु कच्चे तेल परिवहन करने के प्रयोजन के लिये उड़ीसा राज्य के पारादीप से पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य के हल्दिया तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने हेतु संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट तहसिल: राजकनिका, जिला: केंद्रपाड़ा, उड़ीसा की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को ता.06.06.2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी।

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, और सभी उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संबन्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने हेतु अर्जित किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है की उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त हो कर इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिल्हा : केद्रपाडा

राज्य : उडिसा

तहसील का नाम	गाँव का नाम	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
राजकनिका	परिनुआपाडा	2157	00	09	97
		2096	00	05	59
		2099	00	00	10
		2097	00	04	56
		2098	00	02	25
		2090	00	00	43
		2089	00	07	90
		2082	00	00	25
		2083	00	00	76
		2085	00	00	13
		2694	00	02	41
		2086	00	02	68
		2029	00	02	94
		2030	00	04	32

1	2	3	4	5	6
		2684	00	03	96
		2031	00	02	30
		2032	00	01	04
		2033	00	00	10
		2020	00	06	80
		2021	00	00	69
		2017	00	01	10
		2019	00	00	83
		2607	00	01	03
		2018	00	03	40
		2006	00	01	73
		2014	00	00	43
		2007	00	02	28
		2005	00	03	44
		2000	00	07	25
		1999	00	04	50
		2653	00	01	71
		1998	00	05	62
		1994	00	02	99
		1982	00	09	47
		1993	00	00	19
		1983	00	00	50
		1767	00	08	82
		1765	00	07	04
		1760	00	03	20
		1757	00	04	00
		1758	00	04	14
		1761	00	05	13
		1755	00	03	96
		1754	00	02	17
		2600	00	00	40
		1759	00	03	15
		1753	00	02	00
		1388	00	03	06
		1389	00	02	24
		1390	00	03	13
		1393	00	01	40
		1431	00	14	53
		1520	00	00	60

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1521	00	02	88
		1522	00	10	80
		1526	00	00	20
		1527	00	00	20
		1529	00	00	10
		1517	00	11	00
		1392	00	02	80
		1387	00	03	20
		382	00	09	72
		353	00	00	20
		355	00	01	64
		354	00	01	81
		356	00	02	47
		352	00	11	47
		351	00	09	96
		349	00	10	92
		368	00	00	10
		369	00	00	49
		247	00	09	24
		248	00	06	70
		246	00	01	19
		222	00	02	95
		2465	00	01	15
		221	00	03	94
		215	00	00	43
		257	00	00	15
		214	00	08	15
		216	00	10	50
		217	00	00	17
		210	00	07	99
		207	00	06	94
		206	00	01	06
		55	00	06	45

1	2	3	4	5	6
		54	00	07	42
		59	00	05	09
		80	00	02	93
		60	00	00	28
		63	00	06	15
		64	00	06	90
		65	00	04	88
		66	00	03	26
		109	00	01	17
		40	00	00	10
		38	00	02	70
		37	00	05	52
		28	00	08	52
		29	00	02	96
		1	00	00	86
		24	00	01	44
		27	00	00	84
		26	00	04	82
		25	00	01	31
	मिर्जापुर	608	00	06	69
		613	00	03	50
		611	00	06	05
		1117	00	06	30
		604	00	06	70
		603	00	02	43
		615	00	00	55
		600	00	02	76
		599	00	02	46
		1037	00	00	10
		596	00	03	70
		594	00	10	11
		595	00	02	21
		1031	00	01	65
		563	00	04	41

1	2	3	4	5	6
		565	00	07	38
		566	00	00	10
		558	00	04	06
		1046	00	06	29
		550	00	00	38
		556	00	02	67
		551	00	05	75
		552	00	04	70
		553	00	04	25
		1055	00	00	10
		366	00	01	23
		365	00	06	12
		362	00	07	77
		347	00	00	83
		349	00	00	10
		350	00	00	10
		1068	00	01	57
		1067	00	04	20
		247	00	00	10
		248	00	09	95
		249	00	01	05
		1064	00	02	02
		253	00	07	91
		231	00	02	36
		1038	00	03	09
		234	00	00	10
		232	00	06	22
		233	00	09	17
		1062	00	02	66
		221	00	00	17

	2	3	4	5	*6
		203	00	15	18
		206	00	01	68
		204	00	00	21
		205	00	05	48
		168	00	07	45
		167	00	06	62
		169	00	00	40
		171	00	00	20
		170	00	00	60
		172	00	10	40
		147	00	12	49
		145	00	00	44
		148	00	16	83
		150	00	09	67
		149	00	00	10
		151	00	03	96
		142	00	02	57
		141	00	09	41
		1076	00	03	75
		32	00	05	34
		31	00	02	27
		30	00	01	34
		1073	00	00	94
		26	00	04	84
		25	00	04	70
		23	00	00	10
		1097	00	00	50
		22	00	07	80
		21	00	05	56
		20	00	04	54

1	2	3	4	5	6
		19	00	02	36
		11	00	00	63
	कोथापाही	177	00	04	48
		176	00	07	02
		175	00	01	75
		168	00	12	50
		312	00	01	10
		266	00	01	83
		167	00	03	25
		166	00	02	93
		165	00	00	80
		147	00	12	45
		269	00	27	90
		132	00	01	04
		141	00	02	00
		281	00	05	85
		123	00	00	10
		122	00	08	32
		120	00	11	56
		119	00	06	26
		118	00	04	86
		117	00	01	98
		80	00	06	09
		78	00	02	38
		77	00	02	13
		76	00	10	80
		75	00	05	46
		74	00	03	24
		73	00	03	27
		72	00	04	68

	2	3	4	5	6
		67	00	00	81
		79	00	01	76
बालीबन्धा		493	00	40	27
		494	00	10	04
		535	00	00	37
		489	00	05	48
		495	00	01	06
		717	00	03	53
		478	00	03	96
		477	00	08	70
		481	00	00	11
		473	00	06	11
		471	00	03	56
		472	00	01	97
		466	00	02	51
		469	00	05	41
		450	00	06	06
		455	00	03	32
		456	00	02	54
		458	00	12	14
		714	00	01	39
		435	00	27	86
		440	00	10	68
		441	00	04	00
		439	00	04	22
		2	00	02	84
		4	00	00	10
		1	00	16	10
आगापाड़ा		1343	00	02	80
		1344	00	01	11

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1341	00	04	39
		1339	00	04	82
		1342	00	04	67
		1209	00	00	37
		1227	00	00	78
		1229	00	05	67
		1228	00	00	10
		1336	00	04	72
		1230	00	09	51
		1237	00	08	97
		1238	00	00	88
		1240	00	06	48
		1246	00	04	30
		1245	00	03	64
		1244	00	01	50
		1303	00	03	85
		1309	00	00	90
		1310	00	05	82
		1311	00	03	99
		1317	00	02	54
		1319	00	07	85
	पेगरपाड़ा	1898	00	04	05
		1897	00	00	10
		1895	00	00	23
		1894	00	05	55
		1229	00	08	50
		1226	00	09	62
		1225	00	04	77
		1237	00	01	02
		1212	00	02	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1211	00	06	08
		2143	00	02	64
		1213	00	10	79
		1210	00	00	10
		1214	00	00	10
		652	00	26	65
		608	00	00	10
		609	00	28	97
		611	00	00	71
		610	00	12	96
		612	00	01	10
		613	00	03	69
		430	00	04	83
		634	00	01	74
		651	00	14	12
		650	00	00	50
		655	00	01	27
		656	00	13	22
		657	00	04	91
		658	00	11	28
		515	00	01	18
		661	00	00	10
		660	00	08	77
		676	00	01	00
		514	00	00	10
		512	00	15	30
		511	00	03	20
		508	00	03	17
		501	00	00	56
		500	00	01	47

1	2	3	4	5	6
		509	00	12	12
		499	00	00	10
		689	00	00	51
		2187	00	04	98
		690	00	01	00
		707	00	14	13
		706	00	00	10
		708	00	07	66
		709	00	00	10
		712	00	01	38
		710	00	05	44
		711	00	02	99
		821	00	01	70
		820	00	00	81
		822	00	05	03
		819	00	03	57
		818	00	05	38
		815	00	07	65
		814	00	14	99
		813	00	11	09
		810	00	09	87
		806	00	05	78
		809	00	04	23
		807	00	00	10
		808	00	05	97
		2237	00	07	86
		789	00	13	83
		788	00	15	09
		787	00	02	65
नाहुनी		161	00	02	36

1	2	3	4	5	6
		160	00	12	05
		159	00	01	09
		150	00	53	00
		126	00	06	43
		124	00	15	87
		135	00	06	34
		120	00	03	37
		79	00	12	79
		97	00	00	49
		85	00	26	32
		86	00	00	63
		58	00	01	90
		65	00	06	32
		64	00	06	26
		59	00	00	10
		63	00	06	57
		62	00	06	78
		51	00	02	70
पन्की		3328	00	00	84
		3242	00	12	21
		3238	00	07	64
		3239	00	02	38
		3240	00	00	73
		3235	00	06	48
		3234	00	00	56
		3233	00	01	93
		3232	00	04	90
		3231	00	04	74
		3230	00	04	11
		3229	00	02	64

1	2	3	4	5	6
		3228	00	09	18
		3314	00	01	31
		3227	00	00	17
		2857	00	07	41
		3059	00	00	10
		2850	00	03	70
		2858	00	01	46
		2863	00	02	43
		2864	00	09	80
		2866	00	03	76
		3657	00	13	81
		2867	00	11	40
		2868	00	01	46
		2869	00	01	15
		2870	00	00	10
		2865	00	08	81
		2792	00	01	55
		2876	00	02	86
		2791	00	03	72
		2783	00	13	82
		2782	00	02	07
		2775	00	09	96
		2883	00	01	21
		2886	00	11	83
		2887	00	22	26
		2909	00	15	03
		2904	00	70	03
		2651	00	19	50
		1421	00	08	79
		1422	00	01	15

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1420	00	04	19
		1419	00	01	72
		3775	00	00	93
		1425	00	02	91
		1418	00	00	70
		1426	00	10	14
		1436	00	07	36
		1376	00	05	15
		1377	00	02	09
		1378	00	04	11
		1379	00	02	85
		1380	00	03	57
		1381	00	03	23
		1383	00	00	64
		1382	00	06	38
		1330	00	06	76
		1329	00	02	56
		1328	00	00	10
		3352	00	04	18
		1335	00	12	05
		3599	00	02	29
		3598	00	04	96
		1339	00	02	56
		1297	00	03	35
		1296	00	07	85
		1285	00	04	79
		1295	00	02	32
		1283	00	00	25
		1286	00	03	15
		1287	00	02	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1288	00	05	58
		1289	00	02	68
		1284	00	01	12
		1254	00	03	42
		1252	00	03	24
		1251	00	03	96
		1250	00	01	30
		1534	00	00	30
		1535	00	00	32
		1536	00	00	82
		1538	00	03	70
		1540	00	06	01
		1544	00	04	64
		1547	00	03	67
		1545	00	03	96
		1546	00	02	97
		2513	00	02	27
		1626	00	00	57
		1622	00	14	67
		1613	00	00	93
		1623	00	14	84
		3520	00	00	40
		1387	00	00	10
		1950	00	14	80

[फा. सं. आर-25011/12/2004-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th August, 2007

S. O. 2236.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide S.O. No. 925 dated 29.03.2007 issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land in Tahasil-Rajkonika, Dist-Kendrapara, Orissa state specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Crude Oil from Paradip in the State of Orissa to Haldia in the State of West Bengal by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for its Paradip-Haldia Crude Oil Pipeline Project.

And whereas, copies of the said notification were made available to the general public on 06.06.2007.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied, that, the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this Notifications should be acquired.

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6, Central Government hereby directs the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest, on the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

Schedule

District : Kendrapara

State : Orissa

Name of Tehsil	Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rajkonjika	Parinuapada	2157	00	09	97
		2096	00	05	59
		2099	00	00	10
		2097	00	04	56
		2098	00	02	25
		2090	00	00	43
		2089	00	07	90
		2082	00	00	25
		2083	00	00	76
		2085	00	00	13
		2694	00	02	41
		2086	00	02	68
		2029	00	02	94
		2030	00	04	32
		2684	00	03	96
		2031	00	02	30
		2032	00	01	04
		2033	00	00	10
		2020	00	06	80
		2021	00	00	69
		2017	00	01	10
		2019	00	00	83
		2607	00	01	03
		2018	00	03	40
		2006	00	01	73
		2014	00	00	43
		2007	00	02	28
		2005	00	03	44
		2000	00	07	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1999	00	04	50
		2653	00	01	71
		1998	00	05	62
		1994	00	02	99
		1982	00	09	47
		1993	00	00	19
		1983	00	00	50
		1767	00	08	82
		1765	00	07	04
		1760	00	03	20
		1757	00	04	00
		1758	00	04	14
		1761	00	05	13
		1755	00	03	96
		1754	00	02	17
		2600	00	00	40
		1759	00	03	15
		1753	00	02	00
		1388	00	03	06
		1389	00	02	24
		1390	00	03	13
		1393	00	01	40
		1431	00	14	53
		1520	00	00	60
		1521	00	02	88
		1522	00	10	80
		1526	00	00	20
		1527	00	00	20
		1529	00	00	10
		1517	00	11	00
		1392	00	02	80
		1387	00	03	20
		382	00	09	72
		353	00	00	20

1	2	3	4	5	6
		355	00	01	64
		354	00	01	81
		356	00	02	47
		352	00	11	47
		351	00	09	96
		349	00	10	92
		368	00	00	10
		369	00	00	49
		247	00	09	24
		248	00	06	70
		246	00	01	19
		222	00	02	95
		2465	00	01	15
		221	00	03	94
		215	00	00	43
		257	00	00	15
		214	00	08	15
		216	00	10	50
		217	00	00	17
		210	00	07	99
		207	00	06	94
		206	00	01	06
		55	00	06	45
		54	00	07	42
		59	00	05	09
		80	00	02	93
		60	00	00	28
		63	00	06	15
		64	00	06	90
		65	00	04	88
		66	00	03	26
		109	00	01	17
		40	00	00	10
		38	00	02	70

1	2	3	4	5	6
		37	00	05	52
		28	00	08	52
		29	00	02	96
		1	00	00	86
		24	00	01	44
		27	00	00	84
		26	00	04	82
		25	00	01	31
	Mirajpur	608	00	06	69
		613	00	03	50
		611	00	06	05
		1117	00	06	30
		604	00	06	70
		603	00	02	43
		615	00	00	55
		600	00	02	76
		599	00	02	46
		1037	00	00	10
		596	00	03	70
		594	00	10	11
		595	00	02	21
		1031	00	01	65
		563	00	04	41
		565	00	07	38
		566	00	00	10
		558	00	04	06
		1046	00	06	29
		550	00	00	38
		556	00	02	67
		551	00	05	75
		552	00	04	70
		553	00	04	25
		1055	00	00	10
		366	00	01	23

1	2	3	4	5	6
		365	00	06	12
		362	00	07	77
		347	00	00	83
		349	00	00	10
		350	00	00	10
		1068	00	01	57
		1067	00	04	20
		247	00	00	10
		248	00	09	95
		249	00	01	05
		1064	00	02	02
		253	00	07	91
		231	00	02	36
		1038	00	03	09
		234	00	00	10
		232	00	06	22
		233	00	09	17
		1062	00	02	66
		221	00	00	17
		203	00	15	18
		206	00	01	68
		204	00	00	21
		205	00	05	48
		168	00	07	45
		167	00	06	62
		169	00	00	40
		171	00	00	20
		170	00	00	60
		172	00	10	40
		147	00	12	49
		145	00	00	44
		148	00	16	83
		150	00	09	67
		149	00	00	10

1	2	3	4	5	6
		151	00	03	96
		142	00	02	57
		141	00	09	41
		1076	00	03	75
		32	00	05	34
		31	00	02	27
		30	00	01	34
		1073	00	00	94
		26	00	04	84
		25	00	04	70
		23	00	00	10
		1097	00	00	50
		22	00	07	80
		21	00	05	56
		20	00	04	54
		19	00	02	36
		11	00	00	63
	Kothapahi	177	00	04	48
		176	00	07	02
		175	00	01	75
		168	00	12	50
		312	00	01	10
		266	00	01	83
		167	00	03	25
		166	00	02	93
		165	00	00	80
		147	00	12	45
		269	00	27	90
		132	00	01	04
		141	00	02	00
		281	00	05	85
		123	00	00	10
		122	00	08	32
		120	00	11	56

1	2	3	4	5	6
		119	00	06	26
		118	00	04	86
		117	00	01	98
		80	00	06	09
		78	00	02	38
		77	00	02	13
		76	00	10	80
		75	00	05	46
		74	00	03	24
		73	00	03	27
		72	00	04	68
		67	00	00	81
		79	00	01	76
	Balibhanda	493	00	40	27
		494	00	10	04
		535	00	00	37
		489	00	05	48
		495	00	01	06
		717	00	03	53
		478	00	03	96
		477	00	08	70
		481	00	00	11
		473	00	06	11
		471	00	03	56
		472	00	01	97
		466	00	02	51
		469	00	05	41
		450	00	06	06
		455	00	03	32
		456	00	02	54
		458	00	12	14
		714	00	01	39
		435	00	27	86
		440	00	10	68

1	2	3	4	5	6
		441	00	04	00
		439	00	04	22
		2	00	02	84
		4	00	00	10
		1	00	16	10
	Agapada	1343	00	02	80
		1344	00	01	11
		1341	00	04	39
		1339	00	04	82
		1342	00	04	67
		1209	00	00	37
		1227	00	00	78
		1229	00	05	67
		1228	00	00	10
		1336	00	04	72
		1230	00	09	51
		1237	00	08	97
		1238	00	00	88
		1240	00	06	48
		1246	00	04	30
		1245	00	03	64
		1244	00	01	50
		1303	00	03	85
		1309	00	00	90
		1310	00	05	82
		1311	00	03	99
		1317	00	02	54
		1319	00	07	85
	Pegarpada	1898	00	04	05
		1897	00	00	10
		1895	00	00	23
		1894	00	05	55
		1229	00	08	50
		1226	00	09	62

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1225	00	04	77
		1237	00	01	02
		1212	00	02	43
		1211	00	06	08
		2143	00	02	64
		1213	00	10	79
		1210	00	00	10
		1214	00	00	10
		652	00	26	65
		608	00	00	10
		609	00	28	97
		611	00	00	71
		610	00	12	96
		612	00	01	10
		613	00	03	69
		430	00	04	83
		634	00	01	74
		651	00	14	12
		650	00	00	50
		655	00	01	27
		656	00	13	22
		657	00	04	91
		658	00	11	28
		515	00	01	18
		661	00	00	10
		660	00	08	77
		676	00	01	00
		514	00	00	10
		512	00	15	30
		511	00	03	20
		508	00	03	17
		501	00	00	56
		500	00	01	47
		509	00	12	12

1	2	3	4	5	6
		499	00	00	10
		689	00	00	51
		2187	00	04	98
		690	00	01	00
		707	00	14	13
		706	00	00	10
		708	00	07	66
		709	00	00	10
		712	00	01	38
		710	00	05	44
		711	00	02	99
		821	00	01	70
		820	00	00	81
		822	00	05	03
		819	00	03	57
		818	00	05	38
		815	00	07	65
		814	00	14	99
		813	00	11	09
		810	00	09	87
		806	00	05	78
		809	00	04	23
		807	00	00	10
		808	00	05	97
		2237	00	07	86
		789	00	13	83
		788	00	15	09
		787	00	02	65
	Nahuni	161	00	02	36
		160	00	12	05
		159	00	01	09
		150	00	53	00
		126	00	06	43
		124	00	15	87

1	2	3	4	5	6
		135	00	06	34
		120	00	03	37
		79	00	12	79
		97	00	00	49
		85	00	26	32
		86	00	00	63
		58	00	01	90
		65	00	06	32
		64	00	06	26
		59	00	00	10
		63	00	05	57
		62	00	05	78
		51	00	02	70
Panki		3328	00	00	84
		3242	00	12	21
		3238	00	07	64
		3239	00	02	38
		3240	00	00	73
		3235	00	05	48
		3234	00	00	56
		3233	00	01	93
		3232	00	04	90
		3231	00	04	74
		3230	00	04	11
		3229	00	02	64
		3228	00	09	18
		3314	00	01	31
		3227	00	00	17
		2857	00	07	41
		3059	00	00	10
		2850	00	03	70
		2858	00	01	46
		2863	00	02	43
		2864	00	09	80

	2	3	4	5	6
		2866	00	03	76
		3657	00	13	81
		2867	00	11	40
		2868	00	01	46
		2869	00	01	15
		2870	00	00	10
		2865	00	08	81
		2792	00	01	55
		2876	00	02	86
		2791	00	03	72
		2783	00	13	82
		2782	00	02	07
		2775	00	09	96
		2883	00	01	21
		2886	00	11	83
		2887	00	22	26
		2909	00	15	03
		2904	00	70	03
		2651	00	19	50
		1421	00	08	79
		1422	00	01	15
		1420	00	04	19
		1419	00	01	72
		3775	00	00	93
		1425	00	02	91
		1418	00	00	70
		1426	00	10	14
		1436	00	07	36
		1376	00	05	15
		1377	00	02	09
		1378	00	04	11
		1379	00	02	85
		1380	00	03	57
		1381	00	03	23

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1383	00	00	64
		1382	00	06	38
		1330	00	06	76
		1329	00	02	56
		1328	00	00	10
		3352	00	04	18
		1335	00	12	05
		3599	00	02	29
		3598	00	04	96
		1339	00	02	56
		1297	00	03	35
		1296	00	07	85
		1285	00	04	79
		1295	00	02	32
		1283	00	00	25
		1286	00	03	15
		1287	00	02	00
		1288	00	05	58
		1289	00	02	68
		1284	00	01	12
		1254	00	03	42
		1252	00	03	24
		1251	00	03	96
		1250	00	01	30
		1534	00	00	30
		1535	00	00	32
		1536	00	00	82
		1538	00	03	70
		1540	00	06	01
		1544	00	04	64
		1547	00	03	67
		1545	00	03	96
		1546	00	02	97
		2513	00	02	27

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1626	00	00	57
		1622	00	14	67
		1613	00	00	93
		1623	00	14	84
		3520	00	00	40
		1387	00	00	10
		1950	00	14	80

[F. No. R-25011/12/2004-O.R.-1]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2237.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के का. आ. 1054 दिनांक 10 अप्रैल 2007 द्वारा पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना प्रकाशित कर, पारादीप-हल्दिया पाइपलाइन परियोजना हेतु कच्चे तेल परिवहन करने के प्रयोजन के लिये उड़ीसा राज्य के पारादीप से पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य के हल्दिया तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने हेतु संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट जिला: बालासोर, उड़ीसा की भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को ता.07.06.2007 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी।

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।
और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, और सभी उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संबन्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने हेतु अर्जित किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये यह निर्देश देती है की उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त हो कर इंडियन ऑयल कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिल्हा : बालेश्वर

राज्य : उडिसा

तहसील का नाम	गाँव का नाम	खसरा संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
सोरो	गुड	1652	00	03	88
		1642	00	00	47
		2628	00	01	42
		676	00	03	22
		95	00	00	71
		626	00	00	38
		1651	00	00	15
		1469	00	00	11
	पाटीमुन्डा	52	00	00	24
	दिनापाही	223	00	01	02
		198	00	01	12
	ब्रह्मपुर	98	00	04	55
		152	00	00	40
		413	00	00	60
		469	00	03	00
		414	00	00	53
		523	00	00	49
	अन्जी	2242	00	00	11
		2407	00	00	10
		2402	00	00	10
		2352	00	04	65
		2236	00	00	47
		2237	00	01	24
		2368	00	00	22
		2245	00	00	75
	कान्हेओगालपुर	853	00	04	77
	करन्जाबीनधा	1957	00	07	45
		1702	00	03	38
		1703	00	06	94
	डोलपुर	834	00	02	78

1	2	3	4	5	6
बालेश्वर सदर	फतेहपुर	908	00	07	76
	श्रीजन्ग	4911	00	02	73
	चान्दिपुर	347	00	00	10
	साहाजानगर	9	00	00	80
बस्ता		23	00	01	95
	गुडु	5774	00	11	94
		2254	00	08	00
	हिरीगान	1724	00	07	95
		1719	00	04	64
		1722	00	03	02
	पात्रापाडा	742	00	01	73
		755	00	00	18
	पाखराबाद	831	00	00	10
	कडाभौदा	463	00	01	89
		431	00	09	64
	गोठोगडिया	328	00	01	51
	बरखुदी	1042	00	07	24
	पोरापाडा	183	00	04	31
		155	00	09	00
		176	00	01	19
		173	00	01	42
		167	00	02	07
	धनाहांडा	29	00	00	80
	दराडा	3108	00	00	10
	दान्डि	93	00	04	93
	बालिसाहि	2267	00	06	85
	गुहालिपडा	480	00	06	35
		478	00	03	67
		474	00	01	35
		468	00	01	39
	अछुयापडा	338	00	00	97
		341	00	02	76
		343	00	05	60
		295	00	00	65
	पथदुर्गा	1305	00	00	47

1	2	3	4	5	6
	त्रैलोकी	356	00	01	31
		325	00	06	50
बालियापाल	रेमु	777	00	00	64
		1526	00	00	10
		1533	00	00	32
		1994	00	01	59
		1564	00	12	02
	धानंदा	335	00	00	24
		336	00	01	16
		260	00	01	34
		338	00	01	77
	निखीरा	1124	00	00	20
		1285	00	00	80
		1187	00	01	00
		1188	00	00	80
		1190	00	00	60
		1193	00	00	51
		2641	00	01	11
		2642	00	01	00
		1280	00	01	22
		1288	00	02	30
		1093	00	01	84
		990	00	01	70
	पालपड़ा	567	00	00	42
		568	00	03	90
		569	00	00	39
		571	00	00	83
		415	00	00	59
		240	00	00	10
		208	00	02	59
		209	00	02	19
		532	00	02	15
		534	00	00	91
		533	00	06	15
		536	00	04	31

1	2	3	4	5	6
		556	00	03	08
		572	00	01	38
		562	00	03	74
		223	00	00	41
		2344	00	04	11
		787	00	01	72
		1526	00	02	98
		2343	00	01	42
	दखिनपडा	757	00	04	34
जलेश्वर	खालबडिया	859	00	00	10
		896	00	01	10
		256	00	00	72
		897	00	03	22
		229	00	00	78
		223	00	03	44
	कसिदा	1167	00	02	28
		1248	00	02	35
		1169	00	03	25
		1184	00	04	48
		1200	00	00	10
		1246	00	00	10
		1182	00	02	59
		1172	00	02	08
		1719	00	03	12
		1174	00	02	37
		1249	00	02	63
		1745	00	03	00
	गौरीबेलदा	544	00	00	17
		524	00	00	10
		525	00	02	21
	घाटियाडी	72	00	01	52
		541	00	01	60
		852	00	01	44
	नुआपली	1623	00	06	82
		1670	00	00	34

1	2	3	4	5	6
	नाचिंदा	2408	00	05	41
		1917	00	00	48
		1928	00	02	17
		1837	00	08	35
	देनुअरा	191	00	00	10
		706	00	00	10
		862	00	01	68
	गाबगों	1912	00	03	57
		606	00	00	15
		604	00	03	43
		565	00	00	35
		577	00	03	42
		611	00	01	24
		578	00	01	95
		601	00	04	79
		580	00	01	48
		579	00	07	76
		605	00	02	36
		576	00	02	52
		2202	00	02	02
		575	00	02	10
	अलालबिंदा	1931	00	05	86
	रायपुर	1166	00	10	02
	बटग्राम	3388	00	01	68
	कटीसाही	2298	00	03	00
	मोहमंदराजपुर	181	00	00	10
	कुलिदा	1617	00	06	42
		2277	00	00	60
	बलरामपुर	499	00	00	10

[फा. सं. आर-25011/19/2004-ओ.आर-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th August, 2007

S. O. 2237.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, published in the Gazette of India vide S.O. No. 1054 dated 10.04.2007 issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Crude Oil from Paradip in the State of Orissa to Haldia in the State of West Bengal by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for its Paradip-Haldia Crude Oil Pipeline Project.

And whereas, copies of the said notification were made available to the general public on 07.06.2007.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted his report to the Central Government.

And whereas the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied, that, the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this Notifications should be acquired.

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6, Central Government hereby directs the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest, on the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances

Schedule

District : Balasore

State : Orissa

Name of Tehsil	Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Soro	Gud	1652	00	03	88
		1642	00	00	47
		2628	00	01	42
		676	00	03	22
		95	00	00	71
		626	00	00	38
		1651	00	00	15
		1469	00	00	11
	Patimunda	52	00	00	24
	Dinapahi	223	00	01	02
		198	00	01	12
	Brahampur	98	00	04	55
		152	00	00	40
		413	00	00	60
		469	00	03	00
		414	00	00	53
		523	00	00	49
	Anjee	2242	00	00	11
		2407	00	00	10
		2402	00	00	10
		2352	00	04	65
		2236	00	00	47
		2237	00	01	24
		2368	00	00	22
		2245	00	00	75
	Kanheiogolpur	853	00	04	77
	Karanjabindha	1957	00	07	45
		1702	00	03	38
		1703	00	06	94
	Dolpur	834	00	02	78
	Fatehpur	908	00	07	76

1	2	3	4	5	6
Balasore Sadar	Srijang	4911	00	02	73
	Chandipur	347	00	00	10
	Sahajanagar	9	00	00	80
		23	00	01	95
	Gudu	5774	00	11	94
		2254	00	08	00
	Hirigan	1724	00	07	95
		1719	00	04	64
		1722	00	03	02
	Patrapada	742	00	01	73
		755	00	00	18
	Pakhrabar	831	00	00	10
Basta	Kadamouda	463	00	01	89
		431	00	09	64
	Gothagaria	328	00	01	51
	Barakhudi	1042	00	07	24
	Porapara	183	00	04	31
		155	00	09	00
		176	00	01	19
		173	00	01	42
		167	00	02	07
	Dhanhanda	29	00	00	80
	Darada	3108	00	00	10
	Dandi	93	00	04	93
	Balisahi	2267	00	06	85
	Guhapada	480	00	06	35
		478	00	03	67
		474	00	01	35
		468	00	01	39
	Achhuapada	338	00	00	97
		341	00	02	76
		343	00	05	60
		295	00	00	65
	Pathadurga	1305	00	00	47
	Trailoki	356	00	01	31
		325	00	06	50

1	2	3	4	5	6
Baliapal	Remu	777	00	00	64
		1526	00	00	10
		1533	00	00	32
		1994	00	01	59
		1564	00	12	02
	Dhanda	335	00	00	24
		336	00	01	16
		260	00	01	34
		338	00	01	77
	Nikhira	1124	00	00	20
		1285	00	00	80
		1187	00	01	00
		1188	00	00	80
		1190	00	00	60
		1193	00	00	51
		2641	00	01	11
		2642	00	01	00
		1280	00	01	22
		1288	00	02	30
		1093	00	01	84
		990	00	01	70
	Palpada	567	00	00	42
		568	00	03	90
		569	00	00	39
		571	00	00	83
		415	00	00	59
		240	00	00	10
		208	00	02	59
		209	00	02	19
		532	00	02	15
		534	00	00	91
		533	00	06	15
		536	00	04	31
		556	00	03	08
		572	00	01	38

1	2	3	4	5	6
Jaleswar	Dakhinpada Khalabaria	562	00	03	74
		223	00	00	41
		2344	00	04	11
		787	00	01	72
		1526	00	02	98
		2343	00	01	42
		757	00	04	34
		859	00	00	10
		896	00	01	10
		256	00	00	72
		897	00	03	22
		229	00	00	78
		223	00	03	44
		1167	00	02	28
		1248	00	02	35
	Kasida	1169	00	03	25
		1184	00	04	48
		1200	00	00	10
		1246	00	00	10
		1182	00	02	59
		1172	00	02	08
		1719	00	03	12
		1174	00	02	37
		1249	00	02	63
		1745	00	03	00
	Gauribelda	544	00	00	17
		524	00	00	10
		525	00	02	21
	Ghantiari	72	00	01	52
		541	00	01	60
		852	00	01	44
	Nuapali	1623	00	06	82
		1670	00	00	34
	Nachinda	2408	00	05	41
		1917	00	00	48

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1928	00	02	17
		1837	00	08	35
	Denuara	191	00	00	10
		706	00	00	10
		862	00	01	68
	Gabagan	1912	00	03	57
		606	00	00	15
		604	00	03	43
		565	00	00	35
		577	00	03	42
		611	00	01	24
		578	00	01	95
		601	00	04	79
		580	00	01	48
		579	00	07	76
		605	00	02	36
		576	00	02	52
		2202	00	02	02
		575	00	02	10
	Alalbindha	1931	00	05	86
	Raipur	1166	00	10	02
	Batgram	3388	00	01	68
	Katisahi	2298	00	03	00
	Mohamadrajpur	181	00	00	10
	Kulida	1617	00	06	42
		2277	00	00	60
	Balrampur	499	00	00	10

[F. No. R-25011/19/2004-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2238.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलायन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड की आंध्र प्रदेश की संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में थाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री एस.डी. भिसे, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, रिलायन्स गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, हरि नारायण कॉम्प्लेक्स, दूसरी मंजिल, जुना डालडा डिपो, शिवाजी चौक, फर्नीचर मार्केट, उल्हासनगर - 421003, जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल / तहसील / तालुका : अंबरनाथ		जिला : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र		
गांव का नाम	सर्वे / हिस्सा नंबर	आर. ओ. यु. अर्जित करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल			
		हेक्टेयर	एयर	सि. एयर	
1	2	3	4	5	
1) आंबेशिव बु.	17/1B	00	17	10	
	19/6/A	00	03	29	
2) इंदगांव	10/7	00	00	20	
3) कान्होर	52/1 *	00	20	92	
	67/4 *	00	22	46	
	69/2 *	00	19	84	
	69/9 *	00	05	52	
	70/4 *	00	21	00	
	99/1 *	00	06	24	
	100/3 *	00	08	94	
	172/1/B	00	10	40	

* का. आ. 636 दिनांक 23.02.2005 में 3(1) की अधिसूचना का अतिरिक्त क्षेत्रफल

[फा. सं. एल-14014/43/2004-जी. पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2007

S. O. 2238.—Where it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of natural gas from structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, to various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid down by M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Ltd.;

And whereas it appears to the Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri S. D. Bhise, Competent Authority, Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited, Hari Narayan Complex, 2nd Floor, Old Dalda Depot, Shivaji Chowk, Furniture Market, Ulhasnagar-421003, District Thane, Maharashtra State.

Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Ambarnath		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
Village	Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU			
		Hectare	Are	C-Are	
1	2	3	4	5	
1) Ambeshiv Bk	17/1B	00	17	10	
	19/6/A	00	03	29	
2) Indgoan	10/7	00	00	20	
3) Kanhor	52/1 *	00	20	92	
	67/4 *	00	22	46	
	69/2 *	00	19	84	
	69/9 *	00	05	52	
	70/4 *	00	21	00	
	99/1 *	00	06	24	
	100/3 *	00	08	94	
	172/1/B	00	10	40	

* Additional area to 3(1) Notification SO 636 dated 23.02.2005

[F. No. L-14014/43/2004-G.P.]
S. B. MANDAL. Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2239.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलायन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड की आंध्र प्रदेश की संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में थाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मैसर्स रिलायन्स गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि, उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1982 (1982 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री एस.डी. भिसे, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, रिलायन्स गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, हरि नारायण कॉम्प्लेक्स, दूसरी मंजिल, जुना डालडा डिपो, शिवाजी चौक, फर्नीचर मार्केट, उल्हासनगर - 421003, जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल / तहसील / तालुका : कल्याण		जिला : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र		
गांव का नाम		सर्वे / हिस्सा नंबर	आर. ओ. यु. अर्जित करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	एयर	सि. एयर
	1	2	3	4	5
1) अनखर	34/1/1		00	01	30
	34/1/3		00	07	00
2) आपदी	29/1		00	10	00
3) गुरवली	12/2		00	04	60
	34/5A		00	04	58
	34/5B		00	05	04
	62/14		00	01	80
4) मांजली	25/5		00	00	30
	31/3 *		00	06	10
	31/4 *		00	03	02
	69/6		00	13	50
	69/10		00	20	24
	69/12		00	00	60
	69/20		00	09	90
	69/22		00	11	68

1	2	3	4	5
5) वाहोली	7/9	00	32	23
	14/13	00	20	64
	14/14	00	05	17
	14/15	00	33	81
	94/1 *	00	03	90
	114/12	00	21	00
6) टिटवाला	49/6	00	07	91

* का. आ. 3037 दिनांक 23.11.2004 में 3(1) की अधिसूचना का अतिरिक्त क्षेत्रफल

[फा. सं. एल-14014/42/2004-जी. पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2007

S. O. 2239.—Where it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of natural gas from structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, to various consumers of District **Thane** in the State of **Maharashtra**, a pipeline should be laid down by M/s Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Ltd.;

And whereas it appears to the Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to **Shri S. D. Bhise**, Competent Authority, Reliance Gas Transportation Infrastructure Limited, Hari Narayan Complex, 2nd Floor, Old Dalda Depot, Shivaji Chowk, Furniture Market, Ulhasnagar-421003, District Thane, Maharashtra State.

Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil		Taluka: Kalyan	District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
Village		Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU			
			Hectare	Are	C-Are	
1		2	3	4	5	
1) Ankhar	34/1/1		00	01	30	
	34/1/3		00	07	00	
2) Apti	29/1		00	10	00	
3) Guravali	12/2		00	04	60	
	34/5A		00	04	58	
	34/5B		00	05	04	
	62/14		00	01	80	
4) Manjarli	25/5		00	00	30	
	31/3 *		00	06	10	
	31/4 *		00	03	02	
	69/6		00	13	50	
	69/10		00	20	24	
	69/12		00	00	60	
	69/20		00	09	90	
	69/22		00	11	68	
5) Vaholi	7/9		00	32	23	
	14/13		00	20	64	
	14/14		00	05	17	
	14/15		00	33	81	
	94/1 *		00	03	90	
	114/12		00	21	00	
6) Titwala	49/6		00	07	91	

* Additional area to 3(1) Notification SO 3037 dated 23.11.2004

[F. No. L-14014/42/2004-G.P.]
S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2240.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि मथुरा-जालंधर पेट्रोलियम उत्पाद परिवहन के संवर्धन परियोजना के कार्यान्वयन हेतु राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र में मुंडका से राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र के टिकरी कलां एल. पी. जी. बाटलिंग प्लांट तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको, भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के लिए, श्री आजाद सिंह, भूमिअर्जन अधिकारी व सक्षम प्राधिकारी (दिल्ली), इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, उत्तरी क्षेत्र पाइपलाइन्स, कपासहेड़ा-नजफगढ़ रोड, बिजवासन, नई दिल्ली-1100061 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गांव	हदबस्त संख्या	मुस्तील संख्या	खसरा / किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
						हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
पश्चिमी दिल्ली	पंजाबी बाग	मुन्डका	118	89	15	00	11	38
				90	11	00	12	22
					12	00	12	22
					13	00	04	22
					17	00	00	84
					18	00	13	49
					19	00	00	42
					20	00	00	42
					23	00	01	26
					24	00	13	49
				114	9	00	00	84
					10	00	13	07
					11	00	01	69
					12	00	06	32
				115	4	00	06	32
					5	00	09	69
					6	00	04	64
					150	00	01	26
पश्चिमी दिल्ली	पंजाबी बाग	हिरन कूदना			24	00	12	65
					25	00	12	22
					26	00	12	22
					27	00	12	22
					28	00	10	96
					34	00	00	42
					35	00	05	06
					36	00	07	59
					45	00	02	53
					48	00	13	91
					50	00	08	85
					83	00	02	11

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
					369	00	08	01
					370	00	12	22
					371	00	12	22
					372	00	12	22
					373	00	12	22
					374	00	12	22
					375	00	12	22
					378	00	12	22
					466	00	12	22
					467	00	12	22
					478	00	15	17
					479	00	12	22
					480	00	12	22
					483	00	12	22
पश्चिमी दिल्ली	पंजाबी बाग	टिकरी कला	42	18	00	02	11	
				23	00	10	96	
			44	3	00	10	96	
				8	00	10	12	
				13	00	10	96	
				17	00	05	48	
				18	00	08	01	
				24	00	13	49	
			65	4	00	11	38	
				5/1	00	01	26	
				7	00	12	65	
				13	00	13	91	
				18/2	00	12	22	
				19	00	02	53	
				22	00	09	69	
			68	1	00	02	95	
				2	00	00	42	
				9	00	13	49	
				10	00	09	69	
			69	2	00	03	79	
				3	00	13	91	
				4	00	12	65	
				5	00	08	85	
				6	00	03	37	
				7	00	00	42	
				512	00	00	42	
				582	00	02	11	
				1430	00	00	84	
				1433	00	00	84	
				1434	00	00	42	
				1436	00	00	42	
उत्तरी पश्चिमी दिल्ली	सरस्वती विहार	धेवरा	119	81	18	00	06	32
					95	00	07	59

[फा. सं. आर-25011/7/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th August, 2007

S. O. 2240.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that "Augmentation of Mathura-Jalandhar Pipeline system" for the transportation of Petroleum Product from Mundka in the NCT of Delhi to Tikri Kalan LPG Bottling Plant in the NCT of Delhi, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification; Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land, to Shri Azad Singh, Land Acquisition Officer & Competent Authority (Delhi), Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Northern Region Pipelines, Kapashera-Najafgarh Road, Bijwasan, New Delhi-110061.

SCHEDULE

District	Tehsil	Village	Hadbast No.	Mushtil No.	Khasra / Killa No.	Area		
						Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
West Delhi	Panjabi Baug	Mundka	118	89	15	00	11	38
				90	11	00	12	22
					12	00	12	22
					13	00	04	22
					17	00	00	84
					18	00	13	49
					19	00	00	42
					20	00	00	42
					23	00	01	26
					24	00	13	49
				114	9	00	00	84
					10	00	13	07
					11	00	01	69
					12	00	06	32
				115	4	00	06	32
					5	00	09	69

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
					6	00	04	84
					150	00	01	26
West Delhi	Panjabi Baug	Hiran Kudna / Jafarpur			24	00	12	65
					25	00	12	22
					26	00	12	22
					27	00	12	22
					28	00	10	96
					34	00	00	42
					35	00	05	06
					36	00	07	59
					45	00	02	53
					48	00	13	91
					50	00	08	85
					83	00	02	11
					369	00	08	01
					370	00	12	22
					371	00	12	22
					372	00	12	22
					373	00	12	22
					374	00	12	22
					375	00	12	22
					378	00	12	22
					466	00	12	22
					467	00	12	22
					478	00	15	17
					479	00	12	22
					480	00	12	22
					483	00	12	22
West Delhi	Panjabi Baug	Tikri Kalan	42		18	00	02	11
					23	00	10	96
			44		3	00	10	96
					8	00	10	12
					13	00	10	96
					17	00	05	48
					18	00	08	01
					24	00	13	49
			65		4	00	11	38
					5/1	00	01	26
					7	00	12	65
					13	00	13	91
					18/2	00	12	22
					19	00	02	53
					22	00	09	69
					1	00	02	95
					2	00	00	42
					9	00	13	49
					10	00	09	69

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
				69	2	00	03	79
					3	00	13	91
					4	00	12	65
					5	00	08	85
					6	00	03	37
					7	00	00	42
					512	00	00	42
					582	00	02	11
					1430	00	00	84
					1433	00	00	84
					1434	00	00	42
					1436	00	00	42
North West Delhi	Sarswati Vihar	Ghevra	119	81	18	00	06	32
					95	00	07	59

[F. No. R-25011/7/2007-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 2007

का.आ. 2241.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का० आ० 3503 दिनांक 26 सितम्बर, 2005 का अधिकांश करते हुए सिवाय उन बातों के जो ऐसे अधिकरण से पूर्व की गई है या करने का लोप किया गया है श्री एस के ब्रह्मभट्ट, मामलातदार, सरदार सरोवर पुनर्स्थापन एजेंसी-1, वदोदरा गुजरात सरकार को, उनको अपने कार्यभार के साथ साथ भारत ओमान रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड की सेंट्रल इंडिया रिफाइनरी परियोजना से संबंधित वाडीनार (गुजरात) से बीना (मध्य प्रदेश) तक की देशव्यापी कूड पाइपलाइन के लिए, सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन, गुजरात राज्य के राज्यक्षेत्र के भीतर, प्राधिकृत करती है !

[फा. सं. आर-31015/1/2007-ओ.आर.-II]
ए. गोस्वामी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 10th August, 2007

S. O. 2241.—In pursuance of Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) and in supersession of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas S.O. No. 3503 dated the 26th September, 2005, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri S.K. Brahmhatt, Mamlatdar, Sardar Sarovar Rehabilitation Agency-1, Vadodara, Government of Gujarat to perform the functions of the competent authority in addition to his own duties under the said Act. for cross country crude pipeline from Vadinar (Gujarat) to Bina (Madhya Pradesh) of Bharat Oman Refineries Limited's Central India Refinery Project, within the territory of State of Gujarat.

[F. No. R-31015/1/2007-O.R.-II]
A. GOSWAMI, Under Secy.

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2242.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 13/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22013/1/2007-आई आर (सी-II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 18th July, 2007

S.O. 2242.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 13/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of SCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-07-2007.

[No. L-22013/1/2007-IR (C-II)]

AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT
AT HYDERABAD****PRESENT****Shri T. Ramachandra Reddy, Presiding Officer**

Dated the 8th day of June, 2007

L. C. I. D. No. 13/2006**BETWEEN**

Sri Rayudu Rambabu,
S/o late Krishna Rao,
H. No. 514, Gandhinagar,
Godavarikhani-505 209.

... Petitioner

AND

1. The Dy. General Manager,
M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
R K. No. 6 incline,
Ramakrishnapur.
Distt. Adilabad.
2. The General Manager,
M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Ramakrishnapur.
Distt. Adilabad.

3. The General Manager,
M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Srirampur Area, Srirampur.
Distt. Adilabad.

4. The Chairman & Managing Director,
M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Kothagudem.
Distt. Khammam.

... Respondents

APPEARANCES

For the Petitioner : Sri S. Bhagwanth Rao,
Advocate

For the Respondent : M/s P.A. V.V.S. Sarma &
Vijayalakshmi, Advocates

AWARD

This case was taken in view of the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh reported in 1997 (3) I.L.J Supplement, page 1141 in W.P. No. 8395 of 1989 dated 3-8-1995 between Sri U. Chinnappa and M/s. Cotton Corporation of India and two others.

2. This is a petition filed by the Petitioner Rayudu Rambabu against the Management M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., under Sec. 2A (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to set aside the dismissal order dated 7-12-2002 passed by the second Respondent and for reinstatement into service with all attendant benefits and back wages.

3. The petitioner submitted that he has been appointed as a badli coal filler by order dated 21-3-2000 and that he could work 196 musters during the year 2000 excluding the leave availed and other weekly and paid holidays and further he has put up 130 musters during the year 2001. He met with an accident on 12-7-2001 while on duty and that he was referred to orthopaedic surgeon and that he was treated in the Respondent's hospital. On account of his accident he could not regularly attend his duties in the year 2001 and 2002. He was issued with a chargesheet alleging that he was absent from duties without leave sick or prior permission from 20-2-2002 and that he has given an explanation to the chargesheet submitting medical certificates but however an enquiry was conducted on 5-10-2002 and that his father was chronic paralysis patient who was staying with him and that he has to attend his father and further his quarter allotted by the Respondent is situated at a long distance from the place of work. As such he could not attend to his duties. The domestic enquiry conducted by the Respondent is not valid and the findings are frivolous and biased and that he gave an explanation to the enquiry report but the Disciplinary Authority has dismissed him without considering his explanation.

4. The Respondent filed the counter and denied the averments made in the petition and pleaded that the Petitioner was appointed as a badli coal filler w.e.f. 23-3-2000 and posted to work at RK No. 6 incline and the Petitioner has put in only 130 musters in the year 2001 and 8 musters in the year 2002. The Petitioner met with an accident but he was declared fit by the medical authorities on 1-8-2001 and that the Petitioner has put up only 130 musters in the year 2001 and he was continuously absent from 20-2-2002 as such a chargesheet was issued dated 6-6-2002 under the Company's Standing Orders No. 25.31. It is further submitted that the Petitioner did not submit any evidence of medical reports declaring him unfit from the company's hospital for his absence in the year 2002. Since the Petitioner was absent from duty without leave sick or prior permission from the competent authority, chargesheet was issued and enquiry was duly conducted. The Petitioner was given full and fair opportunity during the enquiry and the Enquiry Officer observed the principles of natural justice. The Petitioner has admitted the charges during the enquiry. On submission of the enquiry report a show cause notice was issued furnishing a copy of enquiry report to the Petitioner. On considering the representation by the Petitioner, the Petitioner was dismissed from service and the punishment is in consonance with the gravity of the charge.

5. The Petitioner has not disputed the validity of the domestic enquiry and filed memo to that effect on 14-12-2006.

6. Arguments heard under sec. 11A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

7. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner contended that the Petitioner could not attend to his duties on account of involving in an accident and prolonged treatment and further Petitioner's father was patient and the Petitioner has to attend on his father. Further the Enquiry Officer did not consider the plea of the Petitioner that he could not attend to his duties due to illness and treatment.

8. On the other hand, the Learned Counsel for the Respondent contended that the Petitioner has admitted that the charge of absenteeism and given in writing and the Enquiry Officer accepted the plea of the Petitioner and held that the charge against him was proved and further contended that the punishment imposed is in consonance with the gravity of the charge.

9. The enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer is not disputed and the charge against him that he was absent without sanctioned leave or sufficient cause or prior permission from 20-2-2002. The chargesheet was issued on 6-6-2002. The Petitioner has submitted a memo admitting

the charge. The Petitioner has submitted another letter admitting his absence and also admitted that he was given counseling by the Respondent Management in the presence of the co-workers and family members on 12-6-2002.

10. On considering the material on record it is found that the Enquiry Officer has conducted the enquiry by observing the principles of natural justice and concluded that the charge against the Petitioner was proved basing on the admission of the Petitioner.

11. The Disciplinary Authority on considering the explanation given by the Petitioner and also the past record of his absence, has imposed the extreme punishment of dismissal.

12. It may be noted that when the Petitioner was involved in the accident he was treated in the Respondent's hospital and that he was taken to duty only after declaring him as fit. When he was found to be fit, the Petitioner is expected to attend his duties regularly. The Petitioner could not substantiate his plea that he was absent on account of his illness before the Enquiry Officer. The Learned Counsel for the Respondent relied on 1996(1) SCC page 301 wherein it was held by the Apex Court that unauthorized absenteeism need not be condoned and the Management is right in terminating the services as follows :

"Having noticed the fact that the first Respondent has absented himself from duty without leave on several occasions, we are unable to appreciate the High Court's observations that "His absence from duty would not amount to such a grave charge". Even otherwise, on the facts of this case, there was no justification for the High Court to interfere with the punishment holding that "the punishment does not commensurate with the gravity of the charge "especially when the High Court concurred with the findings of the Tribunal on facts. No case for interference with the punishment is made out". The Hon'ble Supreme Court allowed the Appeal."

13. In view of the circumstances, I do not see any mitigating circumstances to take a lenient view. Further, the punishment imposed by the Respondent is in consonance with the gravity of the charge. Therefore, I do not see any merits in the petition.

Award passed accordingly, Transmt.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her and corrected by me on this the 8th day of June, 2007.

T. RAMACHANDRA REDDY, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for
the Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 2007

का.अ. 2243.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, कलकत्ता टेलीफोन्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोलकाता के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 15/95 को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/64/94+आई आर (डी. यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th July, 2007

S.O. 2243.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 15/95) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Kolkata as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Department and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-07-2007.

[No. L-40012/64/94-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL AT KOLKATA

Reference No. 15 of 1995

PARTIES

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta
Telephones
and

Their workmen

PRESENT

Mr. Justice C.P. Mishra, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCE

On behalf of the : Mr. R.M. Chatterjee, Advocate
Management : with Ms. M. Chatterjee, AdvocateOn behalf of the : Mr. L.C. Haider, Advocate
workmen

State : West Bengal Industry : Telephones

Dated 11th July, 2007

AWARD

By order No. L-40012/64/94-IR(DU) dated 30-6-1995 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under Section 10(1) (d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Telephones in terminating the services of Shri Debnath Chakraborty, Ex-casual workman with effect from 1-7-89 was legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman will be entitled to?”

2. The present reference has been made at the instance of Shri Debnath Chakraborty the concerned workman in this case. The case of the workman as it appears from his written statement in brief is that he worked from 28-6-1988 to 30-6-1989 as a casual labour/daily rated mazdoor under S.D.O. (Phones), 66 Exchange, Howrah under Calcutta Telephones. His job was to look after the P.C.O.s at Howrah Station area and he worked there till 18-2-1989 under Mr. S.K. Kumar, S.D.O. P and Mr. T.B. Bag, J.T.O. For his such work an identity card bearing No. 66/PCO/H-S/88-89 dated 28-6-1988 was issued to him by the said S.D.O.P. The said S.D.O.P. had also issued a certificate dated 25-8-1989 to the workman certifying the number of days for which he had worked. Thereafter the concerned workman was transferred to S.D.O.P., 60 Exchange in terms of the letter dated 18-2-1989 of the said S.D.O.P. An identity card was also issued to the concerned workman on 1-3-1989 and from that he worked there till 30-6-1989. The workman concerned has supplied the details of period of his work showing the total number of days of his work as 319 days. The service of the workman had suddenly been terminated without any notice or justification or compensation without complying with the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 hereinafter to be referred as the Act. It is stated that although the service of the workman concerned had been terminated, one Shri Panchkari Malick a person junior to him with few others were allowed to work at Howrah Station area. It is also stated that after termination of service of the concerned workman. The concerned Area Office had recruited a number of fresh candidates numbering above 30 as casual workmen but his candidature for the same had been ignored. Thereafter the workman approached the conciliation officer and on failure of conciliation efforts of

the conciliation officer the matter was referred to the Central Govt. which ultimately referred the present dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication. The workman has prayed for his reinstatement in service in permanent status with all back wages, increments and bonus etc.

3. The management of Calcutta Telephones has also filed a written statement denying the claims of the concerned workman. It is stated that the present reference is not maintainable because the Calcutta Telephones is not an 'industry' and the Chief General Manager against whom the reference is directed has no legal status independently in the absence of the Union of India who was not impleaded as a party in the case. It is also stated that since the dispute has been referred to this Tribunal under Section 2(k) read with Section 10 of the Act, Section 2A of the said Act has no application here and the reference suffers from inherent defects and the same cannot be adjudicated in its present form. The management has supplied the details of work of the concerned workman from 28-6-1988 to July, 1992 in paragraph 4 of the written statement. The case of the management is that the engagement of the concerned workman stood discontinued with effect from August, 1992 and not 1-7-1989 as claimed by him. In view of the Circular No. 270/6/84-STN dated 30-3-1985 issued by the Director General, Post and Telegraph, New Delhi and circular of even number dated 22-6-1988 issued by the Department of Telecommunication the concerned workman was not liable to be engaged and his engagement was bad in law and suffers from lack of jurisdiction and as such his prayer deserves no consideration. His engagement was temporarily suspended after 30-6-1989 being a need-based engagement and he was re-engaged for 110 days from September, 1991 to July, 1992, so it cannot be said that his service was terminated on 1-7-1989. Therefore, it is not a case of illegal termination for which the provisions of Section 25F could be attracted. It is denied that Shri Panchkari Malik was allowed to work at that time or that he has been retained in engagement or that he is working at present. It is however stated that even if it is so management had not committed any irregularity by retaining said Panchkari Malik in such need-based casual engagement. It is also stated that there is no admission regarding non-compliance of Section 25F of the Act in the management's letter dated 17-8-1993 and the worked "discharged" as stated in the letter is not be taken adversely against the management as the concerned person failed to assess the implication of the same. Management has also denied other allegations of the workmen in seriatim.

4. A rejoinder is also filed on behalf of the workman denying the averments of the management in its written statement and also reiterating the case as stated in his written statement.

5. Parties in this case have examined on witness each. Debnath Chakraborty the concerned workman has been

examined as WW-1 on behalf of the workman. He has stated that he worked as a Chowkidar at Howrah Station P.C.O. from 28-6-1988 to 30-6-1989 for a total period of 317 days. He was appointed by the S.D.O.P. but no appointment letter was given to him. He was however given a written identity card and certificates in this regard. He along with others were however transferred to 60 Exchange on the basis of the circular dated 18-2-1989 of the Calcutta Telephones. He used to get monthly salary against vouchers. According to him his service was terminated on 30-6-1989, but he was neither given any notice nor given any compensation before such termination. He then approached the management for his reinstatement but without any effect. In cross-examination the witness has stated that he is to aware of the procedure for appointment of the regular workmen in the Calcutta Telephones. He has also stated that after his termination one union had raised a dispute over the same but he could not show any document in this regard. He has further stated that except Item Nos. 8, 10, 15, 17 and 23 all other workmen in annexure to Ext. W-4 were regular workman. He has further stated that he was appointed as Chowkidar but he admitted that ext. W-4 filed by him does not show that he was appointed as Chowkidar. This witness has further been examined on recall and he has stated that he does not remember when his service was terminated but it was not before 1991.

6. MW-1, Susanta Kumar has been examined as MW-1 in this case on behalf of the management. He happens to be the Divisional Engineer of Shibpur Telephone Exchange of Calcutta Telephones. He has stated that he knew the concerned workman who worked under him for sometime in 1988-1989. He has also stated that there was no action by the management of Calcutta Telephones in terminating the service of the concerned workman on 1-7-1989. In cross-examination he has stated that the concerned workman was engaged as a casual labour probably in June, 1988. Though he was not sure if any identity card was provided to the workman or not, he has stated that the concerned workman was engaged as a casual labour probably in June, 1988. Though he was not sure if any identity card was provided to the workman or not, he has stated it might be possible. He has admitted his signatures on the documents Exts. W-1 and W-2. He has also stated that the father of the concerned workman happened to be a technician employee at Howrah Station and the concerned workman used to assist him. According to the witness the job requirement was temporary in nature and because there was no requirement, his work was stopped.

7. Six documents have been exhibited on behalf of the workman. Management however has not exhibited any document in this case. Ext. W-1 is the identity Card. Exts. W-2 and W-3 are the two certificates issued to the workman dated 25-8-1989 and 6-9-1990 respectively by the two

different officers of the Calcutta Telephones. Ext. W-4 is the circular dated 18-2-1989 issued by the Calcutta Telephones Ext. W-5 is the attendance register and Ext. W-6 is a letter dated 17-08-1993 written by the Deputy Area Manager (Howrah) addressed to the Assistant Labour Commissioner-II, Kolkata stating the payment particulars in respect of the concerned workman from June, 1988 to June, 1989.

8. So far as the plea raised by the management challenging maintainability of the reference is concerned, it is evident that Calcutta Telephones is an 'industry' as defined under section 2(j) of the Act which says, that "Industry means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers and includes any calling, service, employment, handicraft, or industrial occupation or avocation of workman". The telephone service is also covered by this definition as it also carries on both trade and business providing telephone service to the community which is an essential factor to consider it to be an industry or not as it has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Management of Safdarjang Hospital K.S. Sethy (1970-II-LLJ-266) wherein the expression material service has been stated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as involving an activity carried on through the cooperation between employers and employee to provide the community with the use of something such as electric, power, quarters, transportation, mail delivery, telephone and the like. Such activities are all of commercial character in which something is brought into existence quite apart from the benefit to particular individuals. It is the production of this something which is described as production of material service.

9. Learned Counsel for the management has however submitted that telecommunication is run by the Central Government and it is under the Ministry of Union of India where employees hold office at the pleasure of the President of India. However, Government department is also an industry as defined under the Act in case there is systematic activity for production or distribution of goods and services to satisfy human wants concerned, not spiritual is carried on by them discharging sovereign functions. Moreover, the question of Telecommunication Department being an industry was specifically involved in a case before the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court wherein the claim of a casual worker was challenged by the management by raising the plea of non-maintainability of the reference on this ground and the Hon'ble High Court in 1981-II-LLJ-382 (Tapan Kumar Jana Vs. Calcutta Telephones) held that Calcutta Telephones is an industry and in another case 2004-II-LLJ-1092 the Hon'ble Division Bench had also similarly held that Telecommunication Department is an industry in this regard. The Calcutta Telephones is represented through its Chief General Manager as one of the parties to this

reference and therefore it fulfils the requirement of impleading proper and necessary party in the schedule of reference regarding the claim of the workman concerned and there is no infirmity of any kind as submitted by the learned counsel for the management in this regard.

10. So it can be said regarding the other pleas raised about the maintainability of the reference and a formal defect therein in the schedule of reference sent for adjudication of an industrial dispute under Section 2(k) as the same has not been espoused by any union which is said to be an essential requirement before the Government could refer the matter for its adjudication before the Tribunal. It is evident that in this matter before it was referred by the Government the workman concerned had initiated conciliation proceeding before the Assistant Labour Commissioner *vide* Annexure-G to the written statement of the workman which shows that it was very much an industrial dispute as defined in Section 2 (k) of the Act as two of the office bearers of the union viz. Shri Tushar Kumar Saha, Circle Secretary and Pradip Kundu, Assistant Circle Secretary of B.T.E.U.I.S. & CL-IV of Calcutta Telephones represented the workmen during conciliation proceeding to show it an industrial dispute which of course ended in failure and the Government after being satisfied with that aspect of the matter had referred it to this Tribunal for adjudication. Moreover, such formal defects do not affect the adjudication of the claim of the workman as mere wordings of the reference is not decisive and it is the duty of the Tribunal to decide the points on merit and not to discover the formal defects in the wording of the reference as it has been so observed in the case of Sheshrao Bhaduji Hatwar Vs. Presiding Officer, First Labour Court & Ors. 1992-I-LLJ-672 that—

"Section 10(1)(c) of the I.D. Act empowers the appropriate Government to refer the existing or apprehended industrial dispute or any matter appearing to be connected or relevant to the dispute relating to any item specified in the Second Schedule to a Labour Court for adjudication. Section 2(k) of the I.D. Act defined the term 'industrial dispute'. Any Dispute or difference between the employer and individual workman connected with or arising out of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination is deemed to be an industrial dispute under Section 2-A of the I.D. Act. The definition of industrial dispute is itself wide enough to include any dispute or difference 'connected with the employment or non-employment'. There is a long line of decisions of the Supreme Court taking a view that order of reference should be liberally construed and the reference should not be rendered incompetent merely because it is made in general terms and it is always permissible for the labour Courts or the Tribunals to construe the reference in the light of the backdrop against which it is made and to bring out the real dispute for its decision. The

obvious reason for this approach is not only the width of language used in the definition of 'industrial dispute' in Section 2-A and 10 of the I.D. Act but also the object behind the labour legislation. Industrial peace has to be achieved as early as possible and the battle is generally between unequals."

11. The next point remains to be considered regarding the merit of the claim of the workman concerned who has challenged the termination of his service with effect from 1st July, 1989 without complying with the provisions of Section 25F of the Act in this regard. It is evident that the workman concerned has stated on oath about the period of his service rendered in the Calcutta Telephone during 28-6-1988 to 30-6-1989 which was not challenged to be otherwise on behalf of the management as in paragraph 4 of its written statement the details given also go to support the claim and contention of the workman in this regard that he had worked altogether 319 days in all. Besides that the fact is also so positively proved by the documentary evidence filed on behalf of the workman i.e. Exts. W-2 and W-3 which are the two certificates issued to the workman by the two different officers of Calcutta Telephones in this connection. The identity card, Ext. W-1 and the attendance register, Ext. 5 further go to support the claim of the workman that he had rendered more than 240 days of service prior to the date 1st July, 1989 which is alleged to be the date of his termination in this regard. No doubt it is true that the initial burden of proof lies on the workman to show that he had rendered 240 days of continuous service in the year preceding the date of his termination. However, this burden is fully discharged upon by him in case he has adduced cogent evidence, both oral and documentary in this connection and in case the same is not rebutted by the management it will be taken as positively proved in his favour that he had worked for more than 240 days. The statement given by the management witness, MW-1, Susanta Kumar who had given the aforesaid certificate has also admitted this fact in his evidence and this is also not challenged by the management to show it to be otherwise either during the conciliation proceeding or even before this Tribunal that the workman concerned had not so worked for that much period in this regard. In case the workman had so worked for 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of his termination and in case there has been no compliance of Section 25F of the Act prior to his retrenchment in this regard, any such order of retrenchment passed against him will be illegal and void *ab initio* as it is so held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Mohanlal Vs. Management of Bharat Electronics Ltd., AIR 1981 SC 1253, State of Bombay Vs. Hospital Mazdoor Sabha, AIR 1960 SC 610, National Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. Vs. State of West Bengal, AIR 1967 SC 1206. In view of the above, from the evidence on record it is fully proved and established that the concerned workman had so worked for 240 days

preceding one year from the alleged date of his termination on 1-7-1989 after which he was not allowed to work by the management.

12. Learned Counsel for the management, however, has challenged the claim of the workman in this connection stating that it is not a case of termination of service of the workman or retrenchment in any manner so as to attract the provisions of Section 25F of the Act as it was a case of temporary suspension of work of ad-hoc engagement which was further revived in his favour and he was re-engaged for 110 days for the period from September, 1991 to July, 1992 under the same management of Calcutta Telephones. It is, therefore, is not a case of illegal termination for which the provisions of Section 25F of the Act could be attracted. In this connection it is also submitted that Panchkari Malick had not been retained in service and he is not working at present. Moreover, the management had not committed any irregularity in retaining Shri Malic as his engagement was also a need-based casual engagement. He has also relied upon the admission of the workman concerned in his cross-examination on 11-10-2000 that there was no termination of his service prior to 1991 which itself shows that there was no termination of his service prior to that date and there was no question of his service being terminated on 1-7-1989 as per schedule of reference for which he has claimed the relief in this case. From the evidence on record it is however, found true that the concerned workman had admittedly worked for some period in the year 1991 and 1992 as well even after the date of his alleged termination on 1-7-1989. But, this in no way will affect the claim of the workman who as per schedule of reference has specifically claimed the relief terming the alleged termination of his service with effect from 1-7-1989 saying it to be illegal and void as there had been no such compliance of the provisions of Section 25F of the Act in view of the fact that by that date he had already completed more than 240 days of work proceeding that relevant date in this regard. Before termination of his services or retrenchment he was entitled to get the notice or pay in lieu of notice and also a just compensation before his service could be legally so dispensed with by the management. It is however an admitted fact that that the workman concerned was not allowed to work by the management for more than two years or so after the said date of 1-7-1989 and merely the fact that for sometime he had been given some job thereafter, it in no way will affect his right so available to him under the Act, i.e., to claim the relief for reinstatement etc. in this connection in case there had been any such violation of the Act as it has been found to be there in this particular case from the aforesaid evidence as led by the parties. As it is so proved in a positive way it is very much clear that the workman concerned though had completed more than 240 days of service prior to the relevant date of 1-7-1989, he was not allowed to work by

the management and that too without complying the provisions of Section 25F of the Act in this regard. In view of that it was not a legal and valid retrenchment and so it is clearly illegal and *void ab initio* as in such cases it has been so held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case referred to above viz. Mohanlal (supra) and it has been observed by the Hon'ble Apex Court that :

Before a workman can complain of retrenchment being not in consonance with Section 25F, he has to show that he has been in continuous service for not less than one year under that employer who has retrenched him from service. Section 25B is the dictionary clause for the expression continuous service.

Both on principle and on precedent it must be held that Section 25-B(2) comprehends a situation where a workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months but has rendered service for period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e., the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of Section 25-B and Chapter V-A.

The relevant date will be the date of termination of service, i.e., October 19, 1974. Commencing from that date and contacting backwards, admittedly he had rendered service for a period of 240 days within a period of 12 months and indisputably, therefore, his case falls within Section 25-B (2) (a) and he shall be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of Chapter V-A. Appellant has thus satisfied both the eligibility qualifications prescribed in Section 25-F for claiming retrenchment compensation. He has satisfactorily established that his case is not covered by any of the excepted or excluded categories and he has rendered continuous service for the one year. Therefore, termination of his service would constitute retrenchment. As pre-condition for a valid retrenchment has not been satisfied the termination of service is *ab initio void*, invalid and inoperative. He must, therefore, be deemed to be in continuous service.

As discussed above, it is found that the termination of the service of the workman concerned was not in conformity with the provisions of the Act and as such it is held to be illegal and *void ab initio*.

13. As regards the relief to be granted in his favour in this case, it is no doubt true that the general rule of reinstatement with back wages is the principle to be followed but recently the Hon'ble Supreme Court in number of cases decided for laying down principles to be followed in this connection. The Hon'ble Court has asked to take a pragmatic view in the matter by keeping number of factors in mind, i.e., realizing that an industry may not be compelled to pay to the workman for the period during which he

apparently contributed little or nothing at all to it and/or for a period spent unproductively as a result whereof the employer would be compelled to go back to a situation which prevailed many years ago, namely, when the workman was retrenched. For this, the observations so made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Haryana Roadways v. Rudhan Singh (2005) AIR SCW 4634 are significant to lay down that where the workman had worked for a short period, i.e., less than a year or so and having regard to his other basic qualifications etc. back wages were denied to him although the termination of his service was found to have been made in violation of Section 25F of the Act in this regard. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had laid down the various principles to be considered for awarding back wages or compensation etc! after considering all relevant factors for the same on this count. It has been observed therein that :

"There is no rule of thumb that in every case where the Industrial Tribunal gives a finding that the termination of service was in violation of Section 25F of the Act, entire back wages should be awarded. A host of factors like the manner and method of selection and appointment, i.e., whether after proper advertisement of the vacancy or inviting applications from the Employment Exchange, nature of appointment, namely, whether *ad hoc*, short term, daily wage, temporary or permanent in character, any special qualification required for the job and the like should be weighed and balanced in taking a decision regarding award of back wages. One of the important factors, which has to be taken into consideration, is the length of service, which the workman had rendered with the employer. If the workman has rendered a considerable period of service and his services are wrongfully terminated, he may be awarded full or partial back-wages keeping in view the fact that at his age and the qualification possessed by him he may not be in a position to get another employment. However, where the total length of service rendered by a workman is very small, the award of back wages for the complete period, i.e., from the date of termination till the date of the award, which our experience shows is often quite large, would be inappropriate. Another important factor, which requires to be taken into consideration is the nature of employment. A regular service of permanent character cannot be compared to short or intermittent daily wage employment though it may be for 240 days in a calendar year."

In Allahabad Jal Sansthan v. Daya Shankar Rai, (2005) 5 SCC 124, 2005 AIR SCW 2646 after considering the relevant cases on the point the Hon'ble Apex Court stated :

"We have referred to certain decisions of this Court to highlight that earlier in the event of an order of dismissal being set aside, reinstatement with full back-wages was the usual result. But now with the

passage of time, it has come to be realized that industry is being compelled to pay the workman for a period during which he apparently contributed little or nothing at all, for a period that was spent unproductively, while the workman is being compelled to go back to a situation which prevailed many years ago when he was dismissed. It is necessary for us to develop a pragmatic approach to problem dogging industrial relations. However, no just solution can be offered but the golden mean may be Arrived at."

14. In several other cases also the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that payment of back wages is a discretionary power which has to be exercised keeping in view the facts and circumstances of each case and neither start-jacket formula can be evolved, nor a rule of universal application can be adopted [vide P.G.I. of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh v. Raj Kumar, (2001) 2 SCC 54 : 2001 AIR SCW 77; Hindustan Motor v. Tapan Kumar Bhattacharya, (2002) 6 SCC 41 : 2002 AIR SCW 3008]. In Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan v. S.C. Sharma, (2005) 2 SCC 363 : 2005 AIR SCW 377 the Hon'ble Apex Court held that when question of determination of entitlement of back wages comes up for consideration, prima facie, it is for the employee to prove that he had not been gainfully employed Initial burden is on the employee to show that he remained without any employment. In several cases, similar view has been taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in recent years. In M.P. State Electricity Board v. Jarina Bee, (2003) 6 SCC 141 : 2003 AIR SCW 3380, it was observed that reinstatement in service and payment of back wages is not natural consequence of setting aside an order of dismissal. In Haryana State Co-op. Land Development Bank v. Neelam, (2005) SCC 91 : 2005 AIR SCW 1439, it was stated that the aim and object of Industrial Disputes Act is to impart social justice to the workman but keeping in view his conduct. Payment of back wages, therefore, would not be automatic on entitlement of the relief of reinstatement.

15. From the above cases, it is clear that no precise formula can be adopted nor 'Cast iron rule' can be laid down as to when payment of full back wages should be allowed by the Court or Tribunal. It depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The approach of the Court/Tribunal should not be rigid or mechanical but flexible and realistic. The court of Tribunal dealing with cases of industrial disputes may find force in the contention of the employee as to illegal termination of his services and may come to the conclusion that the action has been taken otherwise than in accordance with law. In such cases obviously, the workman would be entitled to reinstatement but the question regarding payment of back wages would be independent of the first question as to entitlement of reinstatement in service. While considering and determining the second question, the Court or Tribunal

would consider all relevant circumstances referred to above and keeping in view the principles of justice, equity and good conscience, should pass an appropriate order.

16. Considering the aforesaid legal principles to be followed and as observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in other number of cases for keeping number of such factors into consideration, i.e., regarding the length of service, age and qualification, nature of employment etc. it is evident that in the present case the workman concerned had only worked for a year or so in the department prior to his date of retrenchment, i.e., on 1-7-1989. He was not also occupying any such permanent status or having got a regular appointment since he was a casual worker so employed by the management for different period between 1988 and 1992 in this regard. There is no dispute about the wages paid to him for the work done by him as casual worker till the said date of 30-6-1989 or for the work done after that date when he had been given some work by the management, i.e., for the months of September, 1991 to July, 1992 for which he had been so admittedly paid by the management. It is also found that this reference has been made after more than 6 years from the date of 1-7-1989 when the dispute had so arisen between the parties. Apart from that it is also evident that more than 17 years or so has now elapsed since then and admittedly the workman has not contributed anything to the industry and so to burden it with the relief of full back wages or half back wages is not called for even after holding the order of retrenchment to be illegal and void. The workman has also stated only that he was not gainfully employed elsewhere and could not get any job though he tried to procure it. There is no such fact in the pleading itself for this and there is no such evidence led by him for the same so that the management could have shown it otherwise by adducing its evidence in rebuttal in this regard.

17. Considering the case law on the point and applying the principles laid down there to the facts of the present case it is just and proper that instead of granting relief of reinstatement with back wages a lumpsum compensation of Rs. 35000/- may be awarded to the workman as it was so directed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in number of cases viz., State of M.P. & Ors. V. Arjunlal Rajak (2006 AIR SCW 1128), Nagar Mahapalika v. State of U.P. & Ors. (2006 AIR SCW 2497), Haryana State Electronics Development Corporation Ltd. v. Mamni (2006 AIR SCW 2979) and Municipal Council, Samrala v. Sukhwinder Kaur (AIR 2006 SC 2905). The aforementioned amount shall be paid to be workman within a month from the date this Award becomes enforceable, failing which he will be entitled to interest thereupon @ 6% per annum till the date of payment.

C. P. MISHRA, Presiding Officer

Dated : Kolkata,
the 11th July, 2007

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 2007

Date of passing of Award : 5th June, 2007

का.आ. 2244.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिचर्डसन एंड क्रुड्डास (1972) लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-II, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-2/32 ऑफ 2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/69/1999-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th July, 2007

S.O. 2244.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/32 of 2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. II, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-7-2007.

[No. L-42011/69/1999-IR (DU)]

SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 AT MUMBAI

PRESENT

A. A. LAD, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-2/32 of 2001

Employers in Relation to the Management of

RICHARDSON & CRUDDAS LTD., 1972

The General Manager,
Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd.,
Mulund Works, L.B.S. Marg,
Mulund (W),
Mumbai-400 080.

And

Their Workman
The President,
Association of Engineering Workers,
252, Janta Colony, Ramnarayan Narker Marg,
Ghatkopar (E),
Mumbai-400 077.

APPEARANCES

For the Employers : Mr. S. Z. Chowdhary
Advocate

For the Workman : Ms. K.N. Samant
Advocate

AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-42011/69/99/IR (DU) dated 08-03-2001 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd., Mumbai by illegal and unjustified deductions of wages of the workmen (List enclosed) from Shop No. 2 in the months of July and August, 1994 is legal and justified? If not, to what relied the workman is entitled?"

S. No.	No.	Name
1.	1254	P. B. Pawar
2.	2038	V. R. Hotkar
3.	2067	L. N. Bhuvad
4.	2071	A. C. Vetal
5.	2074	H. V. Tare
6.	2093	J. R. Sharma
7.	2096	Chandrabhan Rao
8.	2134	N. R. Votkar
9.	2103	R. B. Das
10.	2128	P. S. Chavan
11.	2112	R. K. Nirbhavne
12.	1379	S. J. Bhoşle
13.	2007	T. M. Thakur
14.	2024	A. J. Bhosale
15.	2068	T. Sevaram
16.	2123	G. B. Kulthe
17.	2128	T. A. Bhurbar
18.	2176	K. J. Yadav
19.	2013	C. L. More
20.	2086	D. G. Nalawade
21.	2129	P. M. Shelar
22.	2029	K. G. Nayak
23.	2118	S. T. Shinde
24.	2087	B. P. Gaikwad
25.	1259	A. C. Akre
26.	2185	R. S. Pal
27.	2178	S. G. Naik
28.	1401	G. S. Sing
29.	2159	R. B. Zhore
30.	2157	S. V. Dorugade
31.	2161	D. B. Ghadigaokar
32.	2079	R. Samuel
33.	2133	J. M. Suryavanshi
34.	2180	R. P. Thakur
35.	1415	S. Madhavrao

S. No.	No.	Name
36.	1416	M. Lingraj
37.	1162	R.G. Yadav
38.	2058	R.S. Lohar
39.	2114	R. Bhalerao
40.	2108	A.D. Mulani
41.	2127	R.K. Kadam
42.	2165	B.S. Jangam
43.	2160	V.S. Surve
44.	2070	M.H. Bhosale
45.	2084	A.S. Gawade
46.	2088	P.K. Shejwal
47.	2089	T.K. Ghadi
48.	2053	H.S. Yadav
49.	2131	M.R. Bhilare
50.	2043	G.T. Manc
51.	2094	A.L. Pedneker
52.	1339	V.A. Ghadge
53.	2039	A.Y. Madne
54.	2132	K.S. Joshi
55.	1371	S.D. Mane
56.	2110	P.B. Yadav

2. Claim Statement is filed by President of the Union on behalf of the workman involved in the reference challenging the transfer order of the workman working in shop No. 2 to shop No. 1 saying not legal and justifiable and requesting to turn down the action of the first party of deducting the wages of the workman involved in the reference deducted on the principle of 'no work no pay' and request to quash and set aside with a direction to pay all that to the workmen involved in the reference.

3. This is objected by first party by filing Written Statement at Ex-10 justifying its action of deduction of salary by following principle of 'no work no pay'.

4. Issues were framed at Ex-13.

5. Meanwhile Second Party filed purshis at Ex.35 intimating that they do not want to pursue the issue involved in the reference. Hence the order:

ORDER

Vide Ex. 35 reference is disposed of:

Date: 05-06-2007

A.A. LAD, Presiding Officer

Ex. No. 35

**BEFORE C.G.L.T. COURT NO. 2 HON'BLE MEMBER,
MUMBAI REFERENCE (IT) NO. 32 OF 2001**

M/s. Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd. ... 1st Party
AND

Association of Engineering Workers ... 2nd Party

MAY IT PLEASE THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL

The 2nd Party Union humbly submits that the concerned majority of the workmen have accepted V.R.S. and are no more employees of the First Party and the remaining few workman are not interested in pursuing the Reference and hence the issue involved does not survive.

Hence it is humbly prayed the above reference may be disposed off as withdrawn. The Union is authorizing Smt. Kunda Samant, Advocate, to withdraw the above reference on behalf of the Union.

Mumbai

Dated: 21-2-2007

P. N. SAMANT, President, 2nd Party Union

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2245.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चैन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 51/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/365/98-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th July, 2007

S.O. 2245.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 51/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 19-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/365/98-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 51/2004

[Principal Labour Court CGID No. 67/99]

In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workman)

BETWEEN

S. Durairaj (deceased) : I Party/Petitioner

And

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z.O., Madurai.

APPEARANCES

For the Petitioner : Sri V.S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative
For the Management : Mr. R. Krishnamachari,
Advocate

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour *vide* Order No. L-12012/365/98-IR(B-I) dated 05-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 67/99 and issued notices to both parties. But, the Petitioner has not filed the Claim Statement before the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court. After the constitution of this CGIT Cum Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 51/2004 and notices were issued to both parties and the Petitioner has not filed the Claim Statement.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri S. Durairaj, wait list No. 334 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it is reported by the representative of the Petitioner that the Petitioner died on 20-2-04 and filed a petition to implead legal heirs of the deceased Petitioner. Since I have given a finding in the LR petition *vide* I.A. order No. 205/2005 dated 2nd November, 2005, that LR application is not maintainable and since no orders were obtained from higher forum, I find the claim is abated and the Petition is dismissed without any costs.

4. Thus the reference is disposed of accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 2007

क्र.आ. 2246—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चैन्सई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 35/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/492/98-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th July, 2007

S.O. 2246.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 35/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-

cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 19-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/492/98-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007.

PRESENT

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 35/2004

[Principal Labour Court CGID No. 333/99]

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen).

BETWEEN

Shri K. Sukumar : I Party/Petitioner

And

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India, Z.O.
Coimbatore.

APPEARANCES

For the Petitioner : Sri V.S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani,
Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour *vide* Order No. L-12012/492/98-IR(B-I) dated 12-03-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 333/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT Cum Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this tribunal for adjudication and this tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 35/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri K. Sukumar, wait list No. 400 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Steel Plant branch from 2-09-1991. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the said branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 02-09-1991, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Mettur branch, the another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31.3.97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to section 25G and

25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-07-88, 07-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 399 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Coimbatore. So far 211 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 705 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees, who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary

employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the waitlist and it was also agreed that waitlist was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 705 wait listed candidates, 211 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 399 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the

Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under section 18(1) of the Act and not under section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 400 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:—

8. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it is reported by the representative of the Petitioner that he is not appearing for the Petitioner and the Petitioner also has not appeared before this Court for further proceedings and hence, the Petitioner was called absent and set exparte.

9. In this case, the Petitioner alleged that he was appointed by Respondent/Bank during 1991 and worked as a temporary messenger and all of a sudden, on 31-3-97 he was terminated from service without any notice or notice of compensation. Since he has continuously worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months, he is entitled to the benefits of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. But, no evidence was adduced on behalf of the Petitioner nor produced any document to establish his contention. The Petitioner has not appeared before this Tribunal to substantiate his claim. As such, I find the allegations of the Petitioner are not established before this Tribunal. Hence, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

10. Thus, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2247.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 242/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/450/1998-आई आर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2247.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 242/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/450/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 242/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 169/99)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen).

BETWEEN

Sri D. Natarajan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani,
Advocates.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/450/98-IR (B-I) dated 12-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 169/99 and issued notices

to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D.No. 242/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:

"Whether the demand of the workman Shri D. Natarajan, wait list No. 716 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?"

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Ambur branch from 27-05-1987. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Ambur branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 27-05-1987, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some time performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Ambur branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in

failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been Regularising according to their whim and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not *bona fide* and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated

17-11-87, 16-07-88, 07-10-88, 09-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 716 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 716 he was not appointed. The said settlements were *bona fide* which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto

31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 716 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:—

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for

the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex.M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex.M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex.W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex.W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex.M 10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex.M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW 1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex.M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex.M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex.M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under

Ex.M10 was prepared on 2-5-1992 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex.M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex.M 10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex.M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex.M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M 10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M 1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device

to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex.M 10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service letter and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not 'produced any document show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence

of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc." It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the ID. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bonafide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per

length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bonafide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 ILJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even

in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery

again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAG NATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K.V. VJEEESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for

determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in

1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARA SINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc / temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door;

(c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 11 SCC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are

only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors. Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS

LTD. AND OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other

inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:

For the Petitioner	WW1 Sri D. Natarajan
	WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent	MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
	MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	1-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines Issued by Rspondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1

W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorptions of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.	W20	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily Wages based on Ex. W4.	W21	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement on The Hindu extending Period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W22	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of Messenger staff.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.	W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the Minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.	W24	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the Settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W25	09-07-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W9	Nil	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ambur Branch.	W26	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W10	15-05-91	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ambur Branch.	For the Respondent/Management :—		
W11	30-06-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ambur Branch.	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care & service conditions	M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the reference book on Staff matter Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.	M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W16	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.	M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
W18	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.	M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
W19	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.	M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
			M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
			M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
			M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No.16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No.1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2248.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 245/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/462/1998-आईआर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2248.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 245/2004) of the Central Government, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/462/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT:

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 245/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 172/99)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause(d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen)

BETWEEN

Sri G. Sridarraj : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative
For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani,
Advocates

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/451/98-IR (B-I) dated 12-2-1999 has

referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 172/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT cum labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D.No. 245/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:

"Whether the demand of the workman Shri G. Sridarraj wait list No. 394 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?"

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at AFS Tamvaram branch. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the AFS Tamvaram branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. The Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometime performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in HVF Avadi branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not

required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been Regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not *bona fide* and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those

employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-1987, 16-7-1988, 7-10-1988, 9-1-1991 and 30-7-1996. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 394 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 720 he was not appointed. The said settlements were *bona fide* which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified

before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under section 18(1) of the Act and not under section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 394 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment

thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (Civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the

Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex.W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex.M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex.M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex.W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex.W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex.M 10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex.M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW 1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex.M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex.M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex.M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that

settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes, and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex.M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex.M 10 namely wait list is not inconformity with the instructions of Ex.M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after the Court order in WMP No.11932/91 in W.P.No.7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not

been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that *"to employ workmen as 'badlies casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal."* Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service letter and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No.11932/91 in W.P. No.7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge

about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme. In the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that *the expression 'actually worked under the employer'* cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc. It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the

provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bonafide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bonafide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LLJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 11 LLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has

limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the

material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAGNATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he

should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K.V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PARASINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is

available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a backdoor; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 IISCC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under

these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come-first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors. Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made

permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Government in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the

settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Government in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:

For the Petitioner	WW1 Sri G. Sridarraj WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent	MW1 Sri C. Mariappan MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	1-8-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.

W2	20-4-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.	W19	17-3-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W3	24-4-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.	W20	26-3-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W4	1-5-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.	W21	31-3-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W5	20-8-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W22	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W6	15-3-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.	W23	13-2-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W7	25-3-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.	W24	9-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W25	9-7-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W9	27-4-84	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by AFS Tambaram Branch.	W26	9-7-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms-creation of part time general attendants.
W10	27-4-84	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by AFS Tambaram branch.	W27	7-2-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W11	27-11-84	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Air Cargo Complex branch.	W28	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W12	27-2-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by HVF Avadi branch.	For the Respondent/Management :—		
W13	19-6-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by HVF Avadi branch.	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W14	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care & service conditions.	M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W15	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.	M2	16-7-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W16	6-3-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17	6-3-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M4	9-1-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W18	6-3-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M5	30-7-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
			M6	9-6-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
			M7	28-5-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No.7872/91.
			M8	15-5-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
			M9	10-7-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
			M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
			M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No.16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2249.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 240/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/469/1998-आईआर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2249.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 240/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No.L-12012/469/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT:

Shri K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 240/2004

[Principal Labour Court CGIT No. 167/99]

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen.)

BETWEEN

Sri D. Ramanakumar : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani, Advocates.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/469/98-IR (B-I) dated 12-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 167/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed

their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this-CGIT-cum labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D.No. 240/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri D. Ramanakumar, wait list No. 511 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Guindy branch from 02-06-1982. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Guindy branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 02-06-1982, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some time performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Guindy branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for

adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Government to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been Regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Government for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not *bona fide* and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-1987, 16-07-1988, 07-10-1988, 9-1-1991 and 30-7-1996.

The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait-listed as candidate No. 508 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 508 he was not appointed. The said settlements were *bona fide* which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary

employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 511 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for

the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to

MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 compares of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released published even after the Court order in WMPNo. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave

vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M 10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service letter and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, *mala fide* and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No.11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes

post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid Holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc." It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the ID. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not *bona fide* and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per

length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the Federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 ILJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even

in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being goodwill between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the Conciliation Officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the Federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the Bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the Bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS' UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery

again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAGNATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd.'s case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K. V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination

in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKAR SAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARA SINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for

applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 11 SCC 1 ASHWANIKUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be

stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors". Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of

selection as envisaged by relevant rules". Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD. AND OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was

not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not intitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

For the Petitioner	WW1 Sri S.Ramanakumar
	WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent	MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
	MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-8-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.

W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wages in Messenger vacancies.	W22	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily Wages based on Ex. W. 4.	W23	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending Period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W24	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai About filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.	W25	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding indentification of messenger vacancies And filling them before 31-3-97.	W26	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about Engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W27	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W9	08-03-85	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W28	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W10	31-03-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W29	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms-creation of part time general attendants.
W11	19-06-87	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Kodambakkam branch.	W30	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W12	30-08-91	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Mannady Branch.	W31	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Officer circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W13	16-04-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Anna University Branch.	For the Respondent/Management :—		
W14	18-03-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy branch.	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W15	11-04-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Gundy branch.	M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W16	01-07-89	Xerox copy of interview call letter.	M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care & service conditions.	M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W18	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-1995.	M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W19	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W20	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
W21	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
			M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
			M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
			M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
			M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2250.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 241/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/455/1998-आईआर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2250.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 241/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/455/1998-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 241/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 168/99)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen)

BETWEEN

Sri S. Panneerselvam : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani,
Advocates.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/455/98-IR (B-I) dated 12-02-1999 has

referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 168/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this-CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D.No. 241/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri S. Panneerselvam, wait list No.455 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Ayanavaram branch from 01-11-1985. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Ayanavaram branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 01-11-1985, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Madras University branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the

Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been Regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were

prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-1987, 16-07-1988, 07-10-1988, 9-1-1991 and 30-7-1996. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 454 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 454 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to

say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 455 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/

Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of

the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex.M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex.M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex.W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex.M 10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex.M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW 1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex.M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex.M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex.M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the

settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 compares of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex.M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex.M 10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex.M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex.M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M 10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M 1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners

were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that *"to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal."* Learned representative further contended that Ex.M 10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service letter and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach, of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, malafide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No.11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no

personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that *the expression 'actually worked under the employer'* cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc. It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of

Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the ID. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bonafide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bonafide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 11 LLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation

proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement;

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of

reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAGNATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been

exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K.V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARA SINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc /

temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SEC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS.

wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors". Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued

for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD. AND OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time

of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not intitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:

For the Petitioner	WW1 Sri S. Panneerselvam WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent	MW1 Sri C. Mariappan MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :—

Ex.No. Date	Description
W1 1-8-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2 20-4-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3 24-4-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4 1-5-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in the Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5 20-8-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in the Hindu extending Period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6 15-3-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai About filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7 25-3-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8 Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9 16-12-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Madras University Branch.
W10 16-12-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Madras University Branch.
W11 9-9-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ayanavaram branch.
W12 5-7-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Madras University Branch.
W13 Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding appointment of temporary employees.
W14 Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W15 6-3-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W16 6-3-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W17 6-3-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.

W18 17-3-97	Xerox copy of the Service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W19 26-3-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi
W20 31-3-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W21 Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W22 13-2-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about Engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list
W23 9-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W24 9-7-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W25 9-7-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms-creation of part time general attendants.
W26 7-2-96	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W27 31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre

For the Respondent/Management :—

Ex. No. Date	Description
M1 17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2 16-7-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3 27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4 9-1-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5 30-7-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6 9-6-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7 28-5-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No.7872/91.
M8 15-5-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9 10-7-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10 Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11 25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No.16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

AWARD

का.आ. 2251.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 40/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/579/1998-आई.आर.(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2251.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 40/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai, as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-07-2007.

[No. L-12012/579/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Dated : 31st January, 2007

PRESENT**K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer****Industrial Dispute No. 40/2004****[Principal Labour Court CGID No. 338/99]**

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri K. Joseph Prestley : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager : II Party/Management
State Bank of India, Z.O.
Coimbatore

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised
Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani
Advocates

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/579/98-IR(B-I) dated 26-3-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 388/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT Cum Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 40/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri K. Joseph Prestley, wait list No. 439 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Mettur branch from 1-2-1985. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under section 18 (1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories. Namely A, B and C. Though the classification unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank was brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Mettur branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 1-2-1985,

the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Mettur branch, another advertisement by Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Government to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Government for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped

from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged for the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-07-88, 07-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was waitlisted as candidate No. 439 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Coimbatore. So far 211 waitlisted temporary candidates, out of 705 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/ Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees

were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 705 waitlisted candidates, 211 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was waitlisted at 439 he was not appointed, The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be, filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed future total ban for his employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified the circulars of Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 439 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it is reported by the representative of the Petitioner that he is not appearing for the Petitioner and the Petitioner also has not appeared before this Court for further proceedings and hence, the Petitioner was called absent and set ex parte.

9. In this case, the Petitioner alleged that he was appointed by Respondent/Bank during 1985 and worked as a temporary messenger and during the year 1986-87 he was disengaged from service and again he was engaged as a temporary messenger, and all of a sudden, on 31-3-97 he was terminated from service without any notice or notice of compensation. Since he has continuously worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months, he is entitled to the benefits of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. But, no evidence was adduced on behalf of the Petitioner nor produced any document to establish his contention. The Petitioner has not appeared before this Tribunal to substantiate his claim. As such, I find the allegations of the Petitioner are not established before this Tribunal. Hence, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

10. Thus, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

क्र.आ. 2252.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 201/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/357/1998-आईआर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2252.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 201/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No.L-12012/357/1998-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 201/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 24/99)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (I) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen)

BETWEEN

Sri S. Gajendiran : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar,
Advocates.

AWARD

I. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/357/98-IR (B-1) dated 03-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal

Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 24/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this-CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 201/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:

"Whether the demand of the workman Shri S. Gajendiran, wait list No. 685 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?"

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Arumbakkam branch from 18-04-1983. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Arumbakkam branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 18-04-1983, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Thirvanmiyur branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from

1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been Regularising according to their whim and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not *bona fide* and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and

when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-1987, 16-07-1988, 07-10-1988, 9-1-1991 and 30-7-1996. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No.680 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 680 he was not appointed. The said settlements were *bona fide* which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to

say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 685 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers. In the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers

and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW 1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald

statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 compares of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that

they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex.M 10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No.11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme. In the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001

and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc. It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bonafide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per

length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bonafide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even

in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Government may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Government is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery

again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VANSAGNATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd., case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K.V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination

in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARASINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those adhoc/temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc / temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door;

(c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an adhoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS. Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are

only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp.) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors". Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arm's length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee....." It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD. AND OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court

has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the

Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:—

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri S. Gajendran
WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambajam.

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam.

Documents Marked :—

Ex.No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-4-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.

Ex. No. Date	Description	Ex. No. Date	Description
W4 01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.	W24 17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W5 20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W25 26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W6 15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.	W26 31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W7 25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.	W27 Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W8 Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference Book on Staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W28 13-02-92	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular Letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W9 21-06-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Arumbakkam Branch.	W29 09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head officer Circular No. 28—regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W10 03-08-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate given by Chepauk PWD branch of Respondent/Branch.	W30 09-07-92	Xerox copy of the Minutes of the Bipartite Meeting.
W11 09-04-90	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Triplicane Branch.	W31 09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general Attendants.
W12 22-07-92	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	W32 07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general Attendants.
W13 17-12-92	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	W33 31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W14 08-12-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	For the Respondent/Management :—	
W15 25-01-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	Ex. No. Date	Description
W16 14-08-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	M1 17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17 09-04-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	M2 16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W18 09-04-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvanniyur Branch.	M3 27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W19 Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care & service conditions.	M4 09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W20 Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference Book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated up to 31-12-95.	M5 30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W21 06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M6 09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
W22 06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M7 28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
W23 06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M8 15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
		M9 10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
		M10 Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
		M11 25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2253.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयरपोर्ट ऑथोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं.-127/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/9/2000-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2253.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. I. D. No. 127/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court II, new Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Airport Authority of India, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-11012/9/2000-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, NEW DELHI

Presiding Officer : R. N. Rai.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 127/2000

In the matter of:—

Shri Rajbir Singh,
S/o Shri Rati Ram,
House No. 226,
Vill & Post : Dhous Saras,
Mettur Dam,
New Delhi-110045.

VERSUS

The Airport Director,
Airport Authority of India,
International Airport Div.
I.G.I. Airport,
New Delhi-110037.

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-11012/9/2000-IR (M) Central Government dt. 10-11-2000 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point is as hereunder :—

“Whether the action of the Management of AAI (IAD), New Delhi, in terminating the services of Shri Rajbir Singh Sweeper, S/o Shri Rati Ram w.e.f. 3-8-98

without complying with the provisions of the I.D. Act is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?”

The workman applicant has filed claim statement. In the claim statement it has been stated that the above named workman had been working with the aforesaid management as sweeper since 21-10-1996 on a last drawn salary of Rs. 3800 per month and was engaged in the filed of sweeping, Cleaning and dusting at the IGI Airport.

That the workman had been working with sincerity and hard work to the entire satisfaction of the management and did not give a single chance of complaint regarding his work during the said service period.

That the management had been guilty of unfair labour practice and had been showing illegal and discriminatory attitude towards the workman without any cause or reason. The management had been illegally appointing employees on contract basis even though the jobs are of permanent nature. This is being done with the illegal motive to avoid payment of legal benefits. The workman had been continuously working with the management since 21-10-1996 without break and it was always maintained by the management that the workman will not be terminated and his employment will be treated as permanent. In any case, the continuous of employment for such a long period confers permanency as has been held by various High Courts and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The above action of the management is illegal, discriminatory.

That as per order dated 6-12-96 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the contract workers engaged in the field of sweeping, cleaning and dusting at IGI Airport were taken under the management w.e.f. 1-2-97. The workman was also issued an Entry Permit bearing No. A-001946 by the management mentioning the designation.

That as per said order of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the management was to regularize all workers. However, the management continued to delay the same. The workman fulfilled all requisite formalities as required for regularization but the workman was not regularized. Various meetings of the workers and the management were held and the management promised to regularize the workers including the workman as per order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

That the management further conveyed the same vide notification dated 24th November, 1997 signed by the Executive Director of the management. The workman also submitted “Charitr Avem Poor-vrit Satyapan form”. The workman also submitted an affidavit. The workman is a Scheduled Caste and eligible to be regularized as per said order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The workman had been demanding the regularizing of his services and approached the management number of times but to no effect.

That the workman has also been discriminated and was not regularised. The management has not been following the principle of equal pay for equal work.

That on 3-8-98, the management passed office order No. AAD/PERS/38(1)/98/68 by which the services of the workman were terminated with immediate effect. The workman was shocked to get this treatment and for this extreme step, which is illegal, and against the settled law.

That the termination of services of the workman without any cause or reason in this manner is illegal, unjustified, discriminatory, against the law of retrenchment and principle of natural justice. This act of the management amounts to unfair labour practice and victimization.

That the workman has been unemployed since the date of termination of his service despite his best efforts and is entitled to reinstatement with back wages and continuity of services and dues.

That the workman also sent legal notice of demand dated 13-11-98 by Registered AD through his counsel but the management failed to comply with the same despite receipt of the same. The management did not give any reply either. The workman also gave reminder notice dated 3-6-99 but to no effect, hence this claim.

The Management has filed written statement. In the written statement it has been stated that the contents of para 1 of the statement of claim under reply as stated are not correct hence denied. It is respectfully submitted that prior to December 1996 the work of cleaning, sweeping and dusting at the I.G.I. Airport was being done through the Contractors who used to employ their own labour force for the said jobs. Shri Rajbir Singh was engaged by the then Contractor M/s. Friends Cobine Services. From a perusal of the records it has been noted that in October, 1996 he performed only (2) two duties, in November, 1996 he performed only (3) three duties and in December, 1996 he did not perform even a single duty. The rate of his last drawn wages is a matter of record.

The true and correct facts are that consequent upon the judgement dated 6-12-96 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India the Contract Labour system in the jobs of sweeping, cleaning and dusting was abolished by the answering management and the workers engaged by the then contractors in the aforesaid jobs were taken under the care of the AAI (IAD), IGI, Airport w.e.f. 1st February, 1997. In terms of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 6-12-96 the management was required to consider for regularization those workers of the then contractors who were engaged in the jobs of sweeping, cleaning and dusting and were working with the contractors as on 6-12-96.

That the management of AAI with a view to comply with the judgment dated 6-12-96 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its letter and spirit took over the services of all the workers of the then contractors working in the

jobs of sweeping, cleaning and dusting pending detailed scrutiny regarding their eligibility for regularization.

The case of all the employees of the then contractors who were engaged in the jobs of sweeping, cleaning and dusting were taken up for scrutiny with a view to regularize them and 558 workers have already been regularized. The case of Shri Rajbir Singh was also taken up for scrutiny and as aforesaid it was found from records that in the month of October, 96 he performed only three duties and in the month of November, 96 he performed only three duties and in the month of December, 96 he did not perform even a single duty. He was given personal hearing to establish his eligibility for regularization and a committee of Housekeeping Supervisors was also constituted to scrutinize the doubtful and difficult cases. This committee of HKS submitted its report dated 27-4-98 from which it is clear that the eligibility for regularization in respect of Shri Rajbir Singh could not be established and, therefore, the services of Sh. Rajbir Singh could not be established and, therefore, the services of Sh. Rajbir Singh were discontinued on 3-8-98 vide office order No. AAD/PERS/38(a)/98: dated 3-8-98.

It is respectfully submitted that the allegations made by the workman against the management have no merit whatsoever as is clear from the facts stated in para 2 above. The management never gave assurance to the workman much less to the effect that his services will not be discontinuing and that he will be treated as permanent. The action of the management is perfectly just, fair and bona-fide besides being legal and suffers from no infirmity as alleged or at all.

It is respectfully submitted that in terms of the judgment dated 6-12-96 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India the management of AAI was required to regularize all such workers who were working as on 6-12-96 with the then contractors in the jobs of sweeping, cleaning and dusting. The judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India may please be looked into for its true and correct meaning and interpretation. As has already been stated above in para 2 that the answering management with a view to comply with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as contained in the judgment dated 6-12-96 started the process of regularisation of such workers and after scrutinizing the cases has already regularised workers. There has not been any willful delay from the management in the scrutiny of the cases for regularization. The workman herein was given due opportunity to establish his claim for regularisation as from the records it was noted that the workman was not fulfilling the necessary conditions for regularisation in that in the month of October, 96 he performed only two duties, in November, 96 he performed only three duties and in December, 96 he has not performed even a single duty. Here it may be pointed out once again that to establish and identify the claim of the workman for regularization a committee of House Keeping Supervisors was constituted and even before this committee, which examined the difficult and doubtful cases including that of

the workman, the workman's claim for regularisation could not be established. The answering management made every effort to regularize the workers as per the judgment dated 6-12-96 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and has not in any manner violated and/or flouted the directions as contained in the said judgment. The workman could not be regularised as he was not fulfilling the required conditions.

It is correct that the management issued a notice/order dated 24th November, 1997 and the same may please be looked into for its true and correct meaning and interpretation. It is respectfully submitted that mere submission of "Charitr Avem Poor-Vrit Satyapan Form" and Affidavit will not entitle the workman for regularization. The workman is required to fulfil the conditions as mentioned in the judgment dated 6-12-96, which he is not fulfilling and is, therefore, neither eligible nor entitled for regularization. The workman has thus not been discriminated in the matter of regularization or in any other manner.

It is respectfully submitted that this discontinuance of service of the workman is perfectly legal, bona-fide and in conformity with the judgment dated 6-12-96 and suffers from no infirmity as alleged or at all.

It is respectfully submitted that a notice dated 3-6-99 was sent by the workman through his Advocate Sh. Jagmal Singh Yadav and the same was replied to by the management vide its letter No. PERS/IR/1103/1/96/1268 dated 21st September, 1999. Apprising him of the true and correct facts.

It is respectfully submitted that the management placed all the facts before the Conciliation Officer but as usual he submitted his failure report.

The workman applicant has filed rejoinder. In his rejoinder he has reiterated the averments of his claim statement and has denied most of the paras of the written statement. The management has also denied most of the paras of the claim statement.

The case was posted for affidavit of the management on 25-04-2007, 09-05-2007 and 19-06-2007. The management did not turn up. The opportunity of filing affidavit was closed on 09-05-2007. The case proceeded ex-parte. The argument of the workman was heard.

It was submitted from the side of the workman that his services were terminated w.e.f. 03-08-1998 without complying with the provisions of the I. D. Act, 1947. The workman was engaged through the contractor for the work of sweeping, cleaning and dusting at IGI Airport w.e.f. 01-02-1997. He was issued entry permit bearing No.A-001946 by the management.

In view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 06-12-1996 the workman should have been regularized.

The workman has examined himself and he has stated that he worked for 27 days in the month of December, 1996. The Hon'ble Apex Court directed the management to regularize the services of all the workmen performing the duties of sweeping and cleaning. The workman was engaged through contractor on 06-12-1996 and in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court he should have been regularized but the management terminated his services arbitrarily and illegally.

The workman has filed Identity Cards and some documents in support of his case. In his cross examination he has specifically stated that he worked for 27 days in the month of December, 1996.

The case of the management is that the workman did not perform duty even for a single day during December, 1996. Some photocopy documents have been filed by the management. These documents are not admissible in evidence. No original document has been filed.

The substantial question to be determined whether the workman was engaged during December, 1996 or not. The workman has filed documentary evidence and he has examined himself in evidence to prove that he discharged duties in December, 1996. The case of the management is that this workman did not work even for a single day during December, 1996. The original documents regarding the working days of December, 1996 are with the management. Those documents have not been filed. Since the management has taken the plea that this workman did not discharge duties for a single day during December, 1996, the management was bound to discharge this burden by filing attendance register etc. on the record to establish the plea, the management has taken. No such documents have been filed. The management has not filed any affidavit in support of its plea of the written statement.

In the circumstances the averments of the claim statement are found proved and the workman is entitled to regularization within 2 months from the date of the award.

The reference is replied thus:

The action of the management of AAI (IAD), New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Rajbir Singh, Sweeper, S/o. Shri Rati Ram w.e.f. 03-08-1998 without complying with the provisions of the ID Act is neither legal nor justified. The management should regularize the workman w.e.f. 03-08-1998 within two months from the date of the publication of the award.

The award is given accordingly.

Date: 29-06-2007.

R. N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2254.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आई.बी.पी.

कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध निोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय लखनऊ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं.-1/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/21/2003-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2254.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 1/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Lucknow as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of I.B.P. Corp. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-30012/21/2003-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
LUCKNOW**

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 1/2004

REF. NO. L-30012/21/2003-IR (MISC) Dt. 3-12-03

BETWEEN

Shri Bachchan Lal Paswan,
S/o Chandraman Paswan,
C/o Sh. Thakur Prasad Chaudhary,
Hira Lal Nagar Colony, Sarojini Nagar
Lucknow

AND

The General Manager (NR)
IBP Corp. Ltd., Bulk Petroleum,
Depot, E-8 Sector-I Near Amausi Railway Station,
Amausi, Lucknow.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide their order No. L-30012/21/2003-IR(Misc.) dated 3-12-2003 referred the following dispute for adjudication to CGIT-cum-Labour Court Lucknow.

“Whether the action of the Management of I.B.P. Co. Ltd. Amausi Lucknow in terminating the services of Shri Bachchan Lal Paswan S/o Shri Chandraman Paswan, Causal Depot, Pump Operator w.e.f. 15-1-2003 is proper and justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?”

The admitted facts are that Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan was engaged on 17-3-97 on consolidated monthly wages of Rs. 4250 and his services were terminated by means of

letter dated 13-1-03 and he was sent active for an amount of Rs. 18770. It is also admitted fact that one Sri Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui as also terminated by the similar order and Sri Siddiqui challenged the order of termination before the Hon'ble High Court by means Writ Petition No. 1175(SS) of 2003 Aftab Ahmed Siddiqui Vs. General Manager, IBP Co. Ltd., and others. The said writ petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 23-10-2003.

The worker has alleged that he was engaged with IBP Co. as Depot Pump Operator and was performing his duties under the control of Sr. Depot Manager, IBP Co. Ltd. Lucknow. The post on which the workman concerned was working was of the permanent and perennial in nature and workman concerned has worked continuously without any break for more than six years before his termination. Under compelling circumstances the workman raised an industrial dispute regarding regularization of his services in the establishment of the employers under the provision of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. After conducting the necessary proceedings the Assistant Labour Commissioner(C) recommended the Central Govt. to refer the alleged dispute for proper adjudication and intimated the parties concerned to the aforesaid effect by means of his letter dated 31-12-2003. Due to the above litigation as well as legitimate claim, the employers became annoyed and with the intent to victimize the workman concerned, the employers terminated the services of the workman by means of the letter dated 13-1-2003. The money for which the employer sent the cheque for Rs. 18770 to the workman, workman returned vide his registered letter dated 6-5-2003. The employers have not reduced any manpower in the establishment but they have awarded the work contract to the private agency which was being carried out performed by the workman concerned and therefore it can not be said that the termination of services of the workman concerned was proper and justified in any manner whatsoever and accordingly the workman concerned is entitled to get the reinstatement alongwith consequential benefits.

Sr. Depot Manager, IBP Co. has filed the written statement wherein it has been pleaded that Bachchan Lal Paswan was engaged as casual labour on 17-3-97 on some VIP reference for cleaning work of plant/machinery at the depot. Earlier the Indian Oil Corporation had no terminal at Lucknow and it used to lift the supply of oil from IBP Company Ltd. depot at Amausi. The Indian Oil Corporation has constructed its own supply terminal and it does not lift the supply of oil from IBP Co. Ltd. As such, the work at Amausi depot of IBP Co. Ltd. has been drastically reduced, resulting into cut of expenditure of the depot. As such, the IBP Company Ltd. has introduced a Voluntary Retirement Scheme for reduction of manpower for its permanent employees. Accordingly vide order dated 13-1-2003, the services of Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan were discharged simplicitor and he was retrenched and was paid an amount of Rs. 18770 towards one month notice wages, compensation @ 15 days wages for every completed year of service and wages for the period 17-3-97 to 15-1-03.

The copy of the termination order was received by Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan on 15-1-2003. Thus, services of Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan was retrenched and there has been substantial compliance of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. After termination of services of Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan preferred an application under Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947 before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow seeking a direction to the employer to take him back in service and if the employer was not ready to take him back in services, then recommend the Government to refer the dispute for proper adjudication before the competent court of law. The said application was sent by the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow to the IBP Company Ltd. vide covering letter dated 24-1-03 for attending the conciliation proceedings IBP Co. Ltd. filed objection to the application. While the proceedings were pending before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan filed a Writ Petition No. 1770 (S/S) of 2003 Bachchan Lal Paswan Vs General Manager, IBP Company Ltd. and Others before the Lucknow Bench of Hon'ble High Court by concealing the suppressing the material fact about the proceedings pending before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow and without furnishing a copy of the writ petition upon the counsel of the IBP Company Ltd. despite receiving the caveat. Vide interim order dtd. 28-3-03, the Hon'ble High Court admitted the writ petition and stayed the operation of the order of termination dtd. 13-1-2003. On 27-3-03 Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan replied to the objections of the IBP Company Ltd. before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow. On receiving the copy of interim order dtd. 28-3-03 efforts were made by the IBP Company Ltd. to get the stay order vacated by filing the application for vacation of interim order supported with a counter affidavit. The Hon'ble High Court vide judgement dtd. 31-7-03 dismissed the writ petition No. 1770 (S/S) of 2003 and discharged the interim order dated 28-3-03, since Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan had concealed material facts in the writ petition upon had also not served copy of the writ petition upon IBP Company Ltd. despite the service of caveat. Amausi Depot of IBP Company Ltd. had no workman employed after the termination of services of Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan and there is no person junior to Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan working at Amausi Depot of IBP Company Ltd. Further, there is no post of permanent workman at Amausi Depot of IBP Company Ltd.

The Sr. Depot Manager has therefore submitted that there is no illegality in the order of termination dated 13-1-2003 and therefore the claim of the workman is liable to be dismissed and Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan is not entitled for any relief.

Worker did not file any document in support of his statement of claim.

Worker has filed his evidence in the form of affidavit

and has filed 4 annexures which are as follows ;

1. Circular about house keeping dt. 28-4-99.
2. Letter dt. 26-12-02 about regularisation of the worker reference No. Lko-8/2/171 purported to be notice.
3. Retrenchment order dt. 12-1-03 with the details of compensation i.e. 4250/- towards one month's salary, notice compensation Rs. 12,395/- calculated on the basis of his services from 17-3-97 to 15-1-03 and Rs. 2125/- wages w.e.f. 1-1-03 to 15-1-03 to the worker by the General Manager, IBP Co. North Region.
4. Letter of worker addressed of Manager, IBP Co. Ltd. Amausi dtd. 6-5-03 returning the cheque for Rs. 18,770.

The opposite party has filed the affidavit of Sri A.P. Rao, Sr. Terminal Manager, IBP Co. Ltd. alongwith following annexures ;

1. Statement of Thrupt for the month of Dec. 2002.
2. Statement of Thrupt for Jan. 2003.
3. Statement of Thrupt for Feb. 2003.
4. Letter of worker dt. 24-7-02 address to ALC (C) Lucknow regarding regularisation.
5. Letter of authorised representative Sri B.P. Singh dated 30-9-02 to ALC (C) Lucknow.
6. Authority letter filed in the office of ALC (C) Lucknow dt. 30-9-02 in favour of Sri B.P. Singh.
7. Reply of the opposite party Sri M.K. Awasthi, Sr. Manager filed before the ALC (C) Lucknow.
8. Photo copy of the notice of ALC (C) Lucknow dtd. 26-12-02.
9. Retrenchment letter dtd. 13-1-03.
10. Second notice No. LKO-8/2/2003 dtd. 24-1-03.
11. Application of the worker dtd. 20-1-03 for reinstatement.
12. Objection of the opposite party.
13. Photo copy of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court in C.M. Application 6778/03 in writ petition 1170(S/S) 2003 Bachchan Lal Paswan vs. General Manager, IBP Co. Ltd. and others.
14. Photo copy of the judgement dt. 31-7-03 passed in writ petition 1770/03 Bachchan Lal Paswan vs. General Manager IBP Co. Ltd. and other passed by the Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow bench.
15. List of permanent workeres working at the Co. Depot. Amausi, Lucknow.

Parties have cross-examined each other witness on

their affidavit.

Heard learned representative of the parties and perused the evidence on record.

It is admitted fact that worker espoused two disputes before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow, first is LKO-8/2/17/2002 regarding regularisation which ended in failure and Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) Lucknow send the failure report to the appropriate Government vide his FOC report No. LKO-8/2/17/02 dtd. 26-12-02, the second case No. LKO-8 (2-2)/03 which pertains to the present case before this court regarding termination.

The appropriate Government i.e. Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi sent reference no. L-30011/1/2003-IR (Misc) dt. 1-5-03 which has been disposed of by the award dt. 4-5-07.

It is not a fact that during the first conciliation proceeding the workman was terminated as the FOC in respect of first case concluded on 26-12-02 and the workman has been terminated on 15-1-03.

It is not disputed that one of the co-worker Sri Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui obtain stay order against the termination, on 21-2-03 and the workman concerned also filed writ petition challenging the termination order issue against him and Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow bench also pleased to pass interim order in favour of the worker but subsequently vide judgment and order dt. 31-7-03 the said writ was dismissed. Although worker Bachehan Lal Paswan did not file writ against the termination order before Hon'ble High Court, but worker Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui filed the writ petition against the termination order which is writ petition No. 1175 (S/S) of 2003 which was dismissed on 23-10-03. In the writ petition filed by Sri Siddiqui he alleged that he was appointed by the opposite party on 15-9-92 in the establishment and was given the posting at Amausi Depot, Lucknow and since then he was working continuously upto 15-1-03. He applied for revision of his pay scale but authorities concerned instead of revising the pay scale terminated the services of the worker by order dtd. 13-1-03. According to Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui the order of termination was arbitrary illegal and erroneous. It was also alleged by the workman subsequent to his appointment on 15-9-92, other worker were appointed and they have been retained where as services of the worker terminated without any retrenchment scheme. It was also alleged that retrenchment can only be made where there is retrenchment scheme approved by the Government and thus the termination order is violation of provision of Section 25G of the I.D. Act, 1947. He has also alleged that his services were terminated without any notice as required under Section 25F (C) and 25 N of the I.D. Act. No prior permission was taken from the Government.

It was contended by the opposite party before the Hon'ble High Court in the aforesaid writ petition that Sri Aftab Ahmed Siddiqui was engaged as casual labour in IBP Co. Ltd. on 15-9-92 on consolidated salary of

Rs. 4510 per month. It was also submitted before the Hon'ble High Court by the opposite party that been paid and the cheque of compensation has been encashed by the petitioner. Denying the worker's encashing allegations about retaining junior workers. The opposite party submitted that no person junior to the worker is engaged at Amausi Depot of IBP Co. Ltd. There is no violation of Section 25G of the Act. The condition precedent to the retrenchment of the workman under sub section (a) and (b) of Section 25F have been complied with while the non compliance of sub-section (c) of section 25F does not amount to any illegality. The provision under Section 25-N of the Act is not applicable because at Amausi Depot, only 10 workmen are employed and therefore, the provisions of Chapter V-B of the Act are not applicable. Hon'ble High Court concluded after hearing the argument of the parties that workman Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui was a casual employee getting a consolidated salary and he had no legal right to continue on the post. Hon'ble High Court also concluded that the order of termination does not suffer any legal infirmity. The opposite party has not adopted retrenchment scheme but in order to meet the requirement of law he has been paid the salary in lieu of one month notice and retrenchment compensation as required under Section 25F of the I.D. Act. and as such the Hon'ble High Court found that there was due compliance of Section 25F (a) & (b) of the I.D. Act. Referring to sub-section (C) of section 25F concluded that the same is not mandatory in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in Jagan Singh vs. Canara Bank and Others (1994) 1 UPLBEC 399 and the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bombay Union of Journalists and Others vs. State of Bombay and another AIR 1964 SC 1627. Hon'ble High Court (Lucknow Bench) further held that Section 25-G is not applicable as no juniors to the workers Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui has been retained.

Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid fact and legal position came to the conclusion that writ is not maintainable for the relief claimed but at the same time Hon'ble High Court observed that since the Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui has been working since 1992, therefore, if any exigency arises for keeping an additional man power, the petitioner shall have the preferential right and the opposite party shall not be permitted to replace the petitioner by another casual labour after sometime arbitrarily and Hon'ble High Court dismissed the writ petition.

Coming to the facts of the present case it is admitted fact that worker was engaged without giving him any appointment letter. He has also admitted that he was not included in the list of permanent workers. He has stated that he was engaged for carrying out misc. work and besides Pump Operation he was sent for work where the urgency required. Worker has also admitted that he received a cheque of Rs. 18770 but he returned the same to the Company. He has also admitted that none of juniors are engaged in the Depot. Worker has also admitted that he sometime carried out the work of casual labour and some how maintains himself. Sri A.P. Rao, Sr. Manager of IBP

in the cross examination he has stated that where ever there was need of unskilled casual labour, worker used to be engaged there. He has also stated in cross examination sometime he was asked to assist the regular worker of the Depot.

Sri AP Rao, Sr. Manager has further stated that work is reduced in the IBP Co. as the Indian Oil Corporation open its own terminal. He has also stated that worker has been send a cheque of entire dues including compensation.

From over all evaluation of the evidence on record I come to the conclusion that case of worker Bachchan Lal Paswan and that of Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui are on the same footing with the following differences;

1. Sri Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui was engaged on 15-9-92 whereas Bachchan Lal Paswan engaged on 17-3-97.
2. Sri Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui encashed the cheque whereas Sri Bachchan Lal Paswan returned the cheque.

In both the cases worker were not regular employee instead they were casual worker engaged on monthly salary in the same Depot of IBP Co. Ltd. Amausi, Lucknow.

It is admitted fact that worker received the cheque and he did not encash it instead opted to return it. Therefore I come to the conclusion that there has been sufficient compliance of the retrenchment.

The judgment of Hon'ble High Court in respect of similarly situated workman is binding to this court also and I come to the conclusion that termination of the worker w.e.f. 15-1-03 is proper and justified. However, the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow on 23-10-2003 in writ petition no. 1175(S/S) of 2003 Aftab Ahmad Siddiqui vs General Manager IBP Co. Ltd. and other shall also be relied to the worker concerned about his engagement in exigency if any in preference to his juniors. The opposite party is directed in the circumstances of the case to issue a fresh cheque to the worker for amount Rs. 18770 within a month of passing of the award. Award passed accordingly.

SHRIKANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

Lucknow

Dated : 6-7-2007

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2255.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उड़ीसा माइनिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट

(संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं.-12/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/31/2003-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2255.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. I. D. No. 12/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court. Bhubaneswar now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Orissa Mining Corporation and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-29011/31/2003-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BHUBANESWAR**

PRESENT

Shri N.K.R. Mohapatra, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE No. 12/2005

Date of Passing Award 4th July 2007

BETWEEN

The Management of the Managing Director,
M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation, OMC House,
Bhubaneswar-751 001, Orissa.

...Ist Party-Management,

AND

Their Workman, Shri Premananda Nayak,
Represented the General Secretary,
Orissa Mining Workers Federation,
C/o. OMC Ltd., OMC House, Bhubaneswar-751001

...IInd Party-Union

APPEARANCES

Shri S.R. Pattnaik, ...For the Ist Party-Management
Manager, Legal

Shri A.K. Samal, ...For the IInd Party-Union
General Secretary

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour,
in exercise of Powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section

(1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-29011/31/2003 (IR (M), dated 20-4-2005 :—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s.Orissa Mining Corporation, in relating to their Barpada Kasia Mines in not allowing Shri Premananda Nayak, Ex-Weigh Bridge Assistant to report for duty and for non-payment of salary and other benefits with effect from 25-7-1997 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the above reference both party appeared and filed their claim statement and written statement. While the case was at the stage of settling the Issue, the Union filed a petition on 31-10-2006 to drop the proceeding but later did not turn up for five consecutive dates. Today i.e. on 4-7-2007 he again appeared and filed a petition to close the case stating the dispute has already been resolved in the meantime on payment of compensatory benefits. During hearing of the said petition the representative of the Management Shri M.R. Mohanty, Advocate, fairly conceded to the stand taken by the Union. According to them the workman having been compensated has now been allowed to join in his post. In view of the above the reference has lost its force being nonest.

3. Accordingly the reference is answered.

N.K.R. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2256.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार त्रिवेन्द्रम एयरपोर्ट ऑथोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निदेशित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय इर्नाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं.-51/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/6/2005-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2256.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (I. D. No. 51/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Ernakulam now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Trivandrum Airport Authority of India, and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-11012/6/2005-IR (M)]

N.S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
ERNAKULAM**

PRESENT

Shri P.L.Norbert, B.A., L.L.B., Presiding Officer
(Tuesday the 3rd day of July, 2007/12th Ashada, 1929)

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 51/2006

(Reference transferred from Industrial Tribunal,
Alapuzha)

Workman/Union : Margaret Fernandez
Kankalil,
Nangiarkulangara P.O.
Alapuzha.

Adv. Shri Thomas Abharam

Management : 1. The Airport Director
Trivandrum Airport Authority of
India (NAD)
Trivandrum International Airport
Trivandrum-695008
2. The Administrator
M/s. Ex-servicemen's Welfare Co-
operative Society Ltd., No. 780
O/o the Registrar of Co-operative
Societies (General), Vanchiyoore,
Thiruvananthapuram.

Adv. Shri V. Santharam

AWARD

This is a reference made by Central Government under Section 10(1)(d) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to this court for adjudication. The reference is :

“Whether the action of the Director, Airports Authority of India, Trivandrum in non-absorbing/terminating the services of Smt. Margaret Fernandez, Contract Labour Cleaner is just and fair? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?”

2. When the matter came up for hearing the worker remained absent continuously. The counsel also remained absent today. There was no representation also for the worker. In the circumstances there is no meaning in keeping the case pending indefinitely. Therefore I find that there is no subsisting dispute for adjudication. Hence the reference is answered that the action of the Director, Airports Authority of India, Trivandrum in not absorbing/terminating the services of Smt. Margaret Fernandez, Contract Labour Cleaner is just and fair and the worker is not entitled for any relief. No cost.

Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 3rd day of July, 2007.

Appendix : Nil

P.L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

AWARD

का.आ. 2257.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. नेशनल इन्टरप्राइजेज के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं. 55/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-26011/2/2004-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2257.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. ID No. 55/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bhubaneswar now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. National Enterprises and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-07-2007.

[No. L-26011/2/2004-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BHUBANESWAR**

PRESENT

Shri N.K.R. Mohapatra, Presiding Officer,

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 55/2004

Date of Passing Award—10th July, 2007

BETWEEN

The Management of the Proprietor,
M/s. National Enterprises, Contractor,
At./Po. Barbil, Dist. Keonjhar.

... 1st Party—Management.

AND

Their Workman, Shri Niranjana Das,
Ex-Miner, At. Jajang Rungta Camp.
P.O., Jajang, Via-Joda, Orissa, Keonjhar.

... 2nd Party—Workman

APPEARANCES

Authorized ... For the 1st Party—Management

Shri Niranjana Das ... For 2nd Party—Union.

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication *vide* their Order No. L-26012/2/2004-IR (M), dated 17-08-2004 :—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s. National Enterprises, Contractor, Jajang Iron Mines of M/s. Rungta Mines Ltd. At Po. Joda Dist. Keonjhar by not allowing duty/terminating the services of Shri Niranjana Das, Ex.-P.R. Mines At/Po. Jajang, Dist. Keonjhar without any charges, domestic enquiry and without observing principle of natural justice is justified? If not what relief the workman is entitled to?

2. After receipt of the above reference both the parties were separately intimated in response to which the workman alone filed his Claim Statement in as back as on 21-7-2005. The Management on the other hand took time after time to file his written statement and ultimately today both the parties filed a joint petition of compromise settling the claim of the disputant at Rs. 13,000/- (Rupees Thirteen Thousand Only) on full satisfaction of his entire demand. The workman who is present in court agreed to have received the said amount in full satisfaction of his claim on condition not to proceed further with the case and make any separate claim in any other forum.

In view of the above the reference is answered in terms of the above compromise dated this the 10th July, 2007.

N. K. R. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2258.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उड़ीसा माइनिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं. 18/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/7/2004-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2258.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. ID No. 18/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bhubaneswar now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Orissa Mining Cooperation and their

workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-07-2007.

[No. L-29011/7/2004-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BHUBANESWAR**

PRESENT

Shri N.K.R. Mohapatra, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 18/2004

Date of Passing Award—10th July, 2007

BETWEEN

1. The Management of Managing Director,
M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation, OMC House,
Bhubaneswar-751 001, Orissa.
2. The Manager (Mines),
South Kallapani Chromite Mines of M/s. OMC Ltd.,
P.O. Kalarangitta, Jajpur (Orissa).

... 1st Party-Managements.

AND

Their Workman, represented through
The General Secretary, Orissa Mining Workers
Federation, C/o. OMC Ltd. OMC house, Bhubaneswar.

... 2nd Party-Workman

APPEARANCES

S.R. Pattnaik, ... For the 1st Party-Management
Manager, Legal.

Shri A.K. Samal, ... For 2nd Party-Union.
General Secretary.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication *vide* their Order No. L-29011/7/2004-IR (M), dated 17-03-2004:—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation Ltd., in relation to their South Kallapani Chromite Mines in not providing equal pay of equal work to the workmen (the details of whom are given in Annexure-A subject to transfer to any other Mine & Prospecting Camp by the Management) incompatibility with their regular counterpart engaged in the Establishment and not regularizing them in the permanent posts of M/s. OMC considering their length of service being engaged in permanent/perennial nature of job, having conferred designation & independent handling of

assigned task is legal and justified. If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to ?

List of Workmen as per Annexure-A

1. Sri D.C. Thatari.
2. Sri Suryamani Haasda.
3. Sri Jitendra Kr. Dash.
4. Sri Janardan Sahoo.
5. Sri Laxman Nath Soren.
6. Smt. Suku Tud.
7. Sri Khetrabasi Dehuri
8. Sri Gadahar Mahanta.
9. Sri Niranjana Geddi.

2. After receipt of the above reference both the parties filed their Claim Statement and counter. While the matter was pending for settlement of issues the General Secretary of the Federation filed at first a petition on 16-4-2007 to drop the case. While this petition was pending for consideration the self same Secretary of the Federation filed today the 10th July 2007 another petition enclosing thereto a minutes of discussion held between the Management and the Federation on 15-5-2007 and contended to pass an award as per the terms of such settlement. On perusal of Para-2 of the above settlement it is gathered that the Management having agreed to the demands of the Union has now decided to give non-permanent status to the DRMP workers like the disputants in question, whereby these workers group would be entitled to get 1/30th basic pay of a regular employee plus proportionate D.A towards their daily remuneration. In view of the above settlement there remains nothing for the Tribunal to answer the reference.

3. Accordingly the reference is answered in terms of the above settlement of the parties.

N. K. R. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2259.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उड़ीसी माईनिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं. 19/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/8/2004-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2259.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. ID No. 19/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bhubaneswar now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Orissa Mining Corporation and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-07-2007.

[No. L-29011/8/2004-IR(M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BHUBANESWAR**

PRESENT

Shri N.K.R. Mohapatra, Presiding Officer,

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 19/2004

Date of Passing Award—10th July, 2007

BETWEEN:

1. The Management of Managing Director,
M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation, OMC House,
Bhubaneswar-751001, Orissa.

2. The Manager (Mines),
Kathpal Chromite Mines of M/s. OMC Ltd.,
P.O. Kalarangitta, Jajpur (Orissa).

... 1st Party-Managements.

AND

Their Workmen, represented through
The General Secretary, Orissa Mining Workers
Federation, C/o. OMC Ltd. OMC house, Bhubaneswar.

... 2nd Party-Union

APPEARANCES:

S.R. Pattnaik, . . . For the 1st Party-Management
Manager, Legal.

Shri A.K. Samal, . . . For 2nd Party-Union.
General Secretary.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following

dispute for adjudication *vide* their Order No. L-29011/8/2004-IR (M), dated 17-03-2004:—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation Ltd., in relation to their Kathpal Chromite Mines in not providing equal pay of equal work to the workmen (the details of whom are given in Annexure-A subject to transfer to any other Mine & Prospecting Camp by the Management) incompatibility with their regular counterpart engaged in the Establishment and not regularizing them in the permanent posts of M/s. OMC considering their length of service being engaged in permanent/perennial nature of job, having conferred designation & independent handling of assigned task is legal and justified. If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

List of Workmen as per Annexure-A

1. Sri Jayaram Munda.
2. Sri Jagan Baipai
3. Smt. Kuni Mahanta.
4. Sri Dillip Kr. Parida.
5. Sri Srikanth Kr. Singh.
6. Sri. Hemanta Kr. Singh.
7. Sri Madhusudhan Prusty.
8. Sri Biju Munda.
9. Sri Arjuna Mahanta.
10. Sri Ananda Majhi.
11. Sri Dhanu Munda.
12. Sri Purna Ch. Nayak.
13. Sri Kuna Tysan.
14. Sri Pandab Mnda.
15. Sri Bena Munda.
16. Sri Mana Munda.
17. Sri Santosh Kr. Moharana.
18. Sri Damu Tudu.
19. Sri Ramachandra Marandi.

2. After receipt of the above reference both the parties filed their Claim Statement and counter. While the matter was pending for settlement of issues the General Secretary of the Federation filed at first a petition on 16-4-2007 to drop the case. While this petition was pending for consideration the self same Secretary of the Federation filed today the 10th July 2007 another petition enclosing thereto a minutes of discussion held between the Management and the Federation on 15-5-2007 and

contended to pass an award as per the terms of such settlement. On perusal of Para-2 of the above settlement it is gathered that the Management having agreed to the demands of the Union has now decided to give non-permanent status to the DRMP workers like the disputants in question, whereby these workers group would be entitled to get 1/30th basic pay of a regular employee plus proportionate D.A towards their daily remuneration. In view of the above settlement there remains nothing for the Tribunal to answer the reference.

3. Accordingly the reference is answered in terms of the above settlement of the parties.

N. K. R. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2260.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उड़ीसा माइनिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी.सं. 17/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/6/2004-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2260.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. ID No. 17/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bhubaneswar now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Orissa Mining Corporation and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-07-2007.

[No. L-29011/6/2004-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BHUBANESWAR**

PRESENT

Shri N.K.R. Mohapatra, Presiding Officer,

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 17/2004

Date of Passing Award—10th July, 2007

BETWEEN

1. The Management of Managing Director,
M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation, OMC House,
Bhubaneswar—751 001, Orissa.

2. The Camp Officer, Chirigunia
Prospecting Camp of M/s. OMC Ltd.,
P.O. Kalarangitta, Jajpur (Orissa).

... 1st Party-Managements.

AND

Their Workmen, represented through
The General Secretary, Orissa Mining Workers
Federation, C/o. OMC Ltd. OMC house, Bhubaneswar.

... 2nd Party—Union

APPEARANCES

S.R. Pattnaik, ... For the 1st Party—Management
Manager, Legal.

Shri A.K. Samal, ... For 2nd Party—Union.
General Secretary.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication *vide* their Order No. L-29011/6/2004-IR (M), dated 17-03-2004:—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation Ltd., in relation to their Chirigunia Prospecting Camp in not providing equal pay of equal work to the workmen (the details of whom are given in Annexure-A subject to transfer to any other Mine & Prospecting Camp by the Management) incompatibility with their regular counterpart engaged in the Establishment and not regularizing them in the permanent posts of M/s. OMC considering their length of service being engaged in permanent/perennial nature of job, having conferred designation & independent handling of assigned task is legal and justified. If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

List of Workmen as per Annexure-A

1. Sri Mata Munda.
2. Sri Kirtan Maharana.
3. Sri Raghunath Hembram.
4. Smt. Gangi Munda.
5. Sri Madha Tiria.
6. Sri. Bansidhar Champia.
7. Smt. Saraswati Munda.

8. Sri Tankadhar Dehuri.
9. Sri Chandrasekhar Hasda.
10. Sri Mirza Zahir Baig.
11. Sri Upendra Kumar Pradhan.

2. After receipt of the above reference both the parties filed their Claim Statement and counter. While the matter was pending for settlement of issues the General Secretary of the Federation filed at first a petition on 16-4-2007 to drop the case. While this petition was pending for consideration the self same Secretary of the Federation filed today the 10th July, 2007 another petition enclosing thereto a minutes of discussion held between the Management and the Federation on 15-5-2007 and contended to pass an award as per the terms of such settlement. On perusal of Para-2 of the above settlement it is gathered that the Management having agreed to the demands of the Union has now decided to give non-permanent status to the DRMP workers like the disputants in question, whereby these workers group would be entitled to get 1/30th basic pay of a regular employee plus proportionate DA towards their daily remuneration. In view of the above settlement there remains nothing for the Tribunal to answer the reference.

3. Accordingly the reference is answered in terms of the above settlement of the parties.

N. K. R. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2261.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पारादीप पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई.डी. सं. 36/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-38011/3/2001-आई आर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2261.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. ID No. 36/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bhubaneswar now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Paradip Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 23-07-2007.

[No. L-38011/3/2001-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
BHUBANESWAR**

PRESENT

Shri N K. R. Mohapatra, Presiding Officer,

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 36/2002

Date of Passing Award—29th June, 2007

BETWEEN

The Management of the Chairman,
Paradip Port Trust, Paradip, Jagatsinghpur,
Orissa-754 142.

... 1st Party-Management.

AND

Their Workmen, represented through the
General Secretary, Qr. No. D-5, V Point,
Paradip Port Trust, Jagatsinghpur-754142.

... 2nd Party-Union

APPEARANCES

Shri Adwait Kr. Das. ... For the 1st Party-
Legal Assistant. Management

Shri B.N. Das, ... For the 2nd Party-Union.
Vice President.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication *vide* their Order No. L-38011/3/2001-IR (M), dated 11-2-2002:—

“Whether the action of the Paradip Port Management by not allowing HRA to employees those who are residing in Dormitory, Bachelor Barrack and Type-I Quarter is justified? If not, what relief the employees are entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the above reference both the parties filed their claim statement and written statement. It is born on record that while the case was pending for hearing the Union took time after time to get ready and ultimately on 1-6-2005 presented a petition to close the case alleging to have settled the matter with the Management. But as no such settlement was filed the case as usual was posted to different dates for hearing exclusively on the prayer of the Union. While this being the position, on 12-6-2007 the Union filed another petition enclosing thereto a Memorandum of Settlement dated 23-5-2007 with a prayer

to close the case in terms of such settlement. On the relevant day the Management was found absent for which the General Secretary of the Union was alone heard on such settlement.

3. From the terms of the settlement dated 23-5-2007 a copy of which has been filed, it transpires that, during pendency of this case the Management having come to terms with the Union has already started paying house rent allowance to those of the workers residing in dormitory, bachelor barrack and Type-I quarters as per its Office Memorandum No. Ad/RR/42/17/9101, dated 23-12-1997 leaving no rooms for the Tribunal to decide the dispute any further.

4. Accordingly the reference is answered as nonest.

N. K. R. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2262.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण आसनसोल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 55/1998) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/435/1997-आई आर (सी-II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th July, 2007

S.O. 2262.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 55 of 1998) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of ECL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-07-2007.

[No. L-22012/435/1997-IR(C-II)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR-COURT,
ASANSOL.

PRESENT:

Sri Md. Sarfaraz Khan, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. 55 OF 1998

PARTIES: Agent, Adjoy-II Colliery of ECL, Charanpur,
Burdwan

Vrs.

The Org. Colliery Mazdoor Sabha(AITUC),
Asansol, Burdwan.

REPRESENTATIVES

For the management: Sri P. K. Das, Advocate.

For the union (Workman): Sri M. Mukherjee, Advocate.

INDUSTRY: COAL STATE: WEST BENGAL

Dated the 25-04-2007

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), Govt. of India through the Ministry of Labour vide its letter No. L-22012/435/97-IR(C-II) dated 27-11-98 has been pleased dated to refer the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Adjoy-II Colliery under Sripur Area of M/s, ECL in dismissing Sh. Md. Issaque Mia, Security Guard on the charges of (i) gross negligence of work (ii) disobedience of lawful instructions of superiors and (iii) violation of Indian Explosive Act is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

After having received the Order No. L-22012/435/97-IR(C-II) dated 27-11-98 of the aforesaid reference from the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for adjudication of the dispute, a reference Case No. 55 of 1998 was registered on 28-12-98 and accordingly an order to that effect was passed to issue notices to the respective parties through the registered post directing them to appear in the court on the date fixed and file their written statement along with the relevant documents and a list of witnesses in support of their claims. Pursuant to the said order notices were issued to the parties concerned by the registered post. Sri P.K.Das, Advocate and Sri M. Mukherjee Advocate appeared in the court with the power of attorney to represent the management and the union respectively. Both the parties filed their written statements in support of their respective claim.

From the perusal of the record it transpires that the record was fixed for hearing on preliminary point and the management was directed to file their enquiry report. The record further goes to show that 25-4-07 was also the fixed date for the same. Both the representative of the parties were present. The learned lawyer of the union submitted that the union is not taking any interest and he has got no instruction either from the side of the union or the workman himself and made an endorsement to that effect in the margin of the record. He further submitted that he does not want to proceed further with the record in absence of any instruction. As such it is clear that the union and the workman have lost their interest in this case. So it is not just, proper and advisable to keep the old record pending any more. Accordingly it is hereby.

ORDERED

that let a "No Dispute Award" be and the same is passed. Send the copies of the Award to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for information and needful. The reference is accordingly disposed of.

MD. SARFARAZ KHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2263.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 48/1997) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-07-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/350/1995-आई आर (सी-II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th July, 2007

S.O. 2263.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 48 of 1997) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Asansol, now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of ECL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-07-2007.

[No. L-22012/350/1995-IR (C-II)]

AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR-COURT,
ASANSOL**

PRESENT

Sr. Md. Sarfaraz Khan, Presiding Officer

Reference No. 48 of 1997

PARTIES: Agent, Bankola Colliery of ECL, Ukhra,
Burdwan

Vrs.

The Jt. General Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor
Union, Ukhra, Burdwan.

REPRESENTATIVES

For the management : Sri P. K. Das, Advocate.

For the union (Workman) : Sri M. Mukherjee, Advocate.

Industry : Coal more State : West Bengal.

Dated 19-6-2007

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), Govt. of India through the Ministry of Labour vide its letter No. L-22012/350/95-IR(C-II)) dated 11/15-7-97 has been pleased to refer the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Bankola Colliery under Bankola Area of M/s. ECL in dismissing Sh. Jogi Rout, U.G. Loader from services w.e.f. 4-6-93 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled to?"

On having received the Order No. L-22012/350/95-IR(C-II)) dated 11/15-7-97 of the aforesaid reference from the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for adjudication of the dispute, a reference Case No. 48 of 1997 was registered on 28-7-97 and accordingly an order to that effect was passed to issue notices to the respective parties through the registered post directing them to appear in the court on the date fixed and file their written statement along with the relevant documents and a list of witnesses in support of their claims. In pursuance of the said order notices were issued by the registered post to the parties concerned. Sri P.K. Das, Advocate and Sri M. Mukherjee, Advocate appeared in the court with the power of attorney granted by the competent authority to represent the management and the union respectively.

From perusal of the record it transpires that written statement were filed by the side of both the parties in support of their respective claim. It is further clear from the order sheets of the record that the case was fixed for hearing on merit of the case. It further transpires from the record that the union left taking any step right from 9-3-06 to 19-6-07 and no step was being taken by the lawyer too which go to indicate that the union or the workman is not interested to continue and proceed with the case further. So it is not just and proper to keep this old record pending any more as no useful purpose is to be served. As such it is hereby.

ORDERED

That let a "No Dispute Award" be and the same is passed. Send the copies of the award to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for information and needful. The reference is accordingly disposed of.

Md. SARFARAZ KHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2264.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 236/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/439/98-आईआर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2264.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 236/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 19-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/439/98-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT:

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 236/2004

[Principal Labour Court CGID No. 163/99]

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause(d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen)

BETWEEN

Sri C. Krishnan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V.S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani,
Advocates.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/439/98-IR (B-I) dated 12-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 163/99 and issued notices

to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this-CGIT-cum Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D.No. 236/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri C. Krishnan, wait list No. 590 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Sidco Industrial Estate, Ambattur branch from 20-8-1981. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Ambattur Industrial Estate Branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 20-08-1981, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some time performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in IAF, Avadi branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard

to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whim and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff

Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-07-88, 07-10-88, 09-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 586 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 586 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of

permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by Employment Exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 590 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :—

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (Civil) of 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Sections 25G and 25H are very much

applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in

support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 compares of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M1 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement

on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M 10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service letter and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No.11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to

voluntary retirement scheme. In the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc. It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the ID. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/

Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bonafide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bonafide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 ILLJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties

to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide

the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAG NATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings

reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K.V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARA SINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc / temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he

was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an *ad-hoc* employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 11 SCC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on *ad-hoc* basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot

be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors. Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of *ad-hoc* employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if

the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD. AND OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Government in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement

and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of *mala fide*, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not intitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Government in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:—

For the Petitioner	WW1 Sri C. Krishnan
	WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent	MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
	MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	1-8-88	Xerox copy of the papaer publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-4-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines Issued by Rspondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.

W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily Wages based in Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending Period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai About filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuls not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	21-02-85	Xerox copy of the interview letter from Respondent/Bank Branch.
W10	06-04-82	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ambattur Industrial Estate Branch.
W11	19-12-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by MRL Branch.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by AFS Avadi Branch.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding appointment of temporary employees.
W14	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—V. Muralikanman.
W16	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office For interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W17	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W18	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W19	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.

W20	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W21	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W22	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about Engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W23	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of Messenger staff.
W24	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W25	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W26	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W27	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2265.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 28/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/432/1998-आईआर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2265.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 228/2004) of the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/432/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 228/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 127/99)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (I) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen)

BETWEEN

Sri P. M. Ganesan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar,
Advocates.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/432/98-IR (B-I) dated 10-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 127/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this-CGIT-cum labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 228/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:-

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri P. M. Ganesan, wait list No. 415 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:-

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Ponneri branch from 14-04-1982. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Ponneri branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 14-04-1982, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Ponneri branch, another advertisement

by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories, only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not *bona fide* and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement

and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-1987, 16-07-1988, 07-10-1988, 9-1-1991 and 30-7-1996. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 415 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 415 he was not appointed. The said settlements were *bona fide* which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far

and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 415 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:—

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) of 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict

instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex.W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex.M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex.M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex.W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex.W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex.M 10 in this case. Those

candidates under Ex.M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW 1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex.M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex.M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex.M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 compares of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex.M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex.M 10 namely wait list is not inconformity with the instructions of Ex.M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after' the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex.M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M'10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M 1 was not

produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority. In the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service letter and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not 'produced any document show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in " accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased

to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme. In the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 2 LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression '*actually worked under the employer*' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc. It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner

in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bonafide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bonafide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the

rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the

rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAG NATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it

is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K. V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARA SINGH AND OTHERS

wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc/temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc / temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SEC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to

exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors. Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further,

the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD. AND OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:

For the Petitioner	WW1 Sri P.M. Ganesan
	WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent	MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
	MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam.

Documents Marked:—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-4-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in the Hindu on daily Wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in the Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instructions in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	09-12-94	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ponneri Branch.
W10	15-04-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Madras Harbour Branch.
W11	19-07-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Manali MFL branch.
W12	17-02-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Ponneri branch.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in Reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding appointment of temporary employees.
W14	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W16	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W17	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.

W18	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W19	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W20	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W21	Feb. '2005	Xerox copy of the Pay Slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W22	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about Engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W23	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W24	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W25	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W26	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W27	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management:—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का.आ. 2266.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 222/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/378/98-आईआर(बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2266.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 222/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No.L-12012/378/98-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

Shri K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 222/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 96/99)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause(d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen)

BETWEEN

Sri M.P. Sugumar : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General Manager, : II Party/Management
State Bank of India,
Z. O. Chennai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar,
Advocates.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide Order No. L-12012/378/98-IR (B-I) dated 05-02-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 96/99 and issued notices

to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their Claim Statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D.No. 222/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri M.P. Sugumar, wait list No. 457 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Karumbur branch from 02-03-1981. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject-matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 02-03-1981, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some time performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Karumbur branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-1997 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-1997. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this

Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-1997 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G & 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of Para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I.D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-1987, 16-07-1988, 07-10-1988, 9-1-1991 and 30-7-1996.

The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 457 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B, and C. considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended up to 31-3-1997 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-1994. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 457 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary

employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by Employment Exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are : —

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 457 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (Civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter VA of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner

contended that in 1996 LAB & IC 2248 CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA Vs. S. SATYAM AND OTHERS the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex.W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex.M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B & C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1 (a) of Ex.M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex.W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex.W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex.M 10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex.M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex.M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex.M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex.M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but

there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P.No.7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondents are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex.M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex.M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 & 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex.M 10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex.M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released / published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex.M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates' date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex.M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal

clause 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. SINGH Vs. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not 'produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme. In the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's

case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I.D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds. have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 WORKMEN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION Vs. MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc." It is further, argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he

was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 ILLJ 323 ASSOCIATED GLASS INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL A.P. AND OTHERS wherein under section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 1189 ASHOK AND OTHERS Vs. MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION AND OTHERS wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the Conciliation Officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 308 K.C.P. LTD. Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even

in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 NATIONAL ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES LTD. Vs. STATE OF RAJASTHAN AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the freewill of the parties and is a pointer to there being goodwill between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 SECRETARY, KOLLAM JILLA HOTEL AND SHOP WORKERS UNION Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery

again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 VAN SAGNATHAN ORIENT PAPER MILLS Vs. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL & ORS. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. SAMBANTHAN Vs. PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, MADRAS, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Vs. K.V. VIJESH wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination

in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 SYNDICATE BANK & ORS. Vs. SHANKAR PAUL AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 SHANKARSAN DASH Vs. UNION OF INDIA wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. Vs. PIARA SINGH AND OTHERS wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc / temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door

(c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment. (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 IJSCMC 1 ASHWANI KUMAR AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHERS wherein the Full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 HIMANSHU KUMAR VIDYARTHI & ORS Vs. STATE OF BIHAR AND ORS. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are

only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come - first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and, therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA Vs. UMA DEVI, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee..... It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD. AND

OTHERS Vs. SOMVIR SINGH, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in **CDJ 2006 SC 395 MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, SUJANPUR Vs. SURINDER KUMAR**, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in **2006 2 LLN 89 MADHYA PRADESH STATE AGRO INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION Vs. S.C. PANDEY** wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other

inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent /Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not intitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2:

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined:

For the Petitioner WW1 Sri M.P. Sugumar
 WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent MW1 Sri C. Marlappan
 MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines Issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1

W3	24-4-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.	W18	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment Order to Sri G. Pandi.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily Wages based on Ex. W4.	W19	Feb'2005	Xerox copy of the Pay Slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending Period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W20	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about Engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai About filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.	W21	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Circular No. 28 Regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.	W22	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the Settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general Attendants.
W9	25-08-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Karumbur Branch.	W24	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W10	Nil	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Karumbur Branch.	W25	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the Local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W11	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre & service conditions.	For the Respondent/Management :—		
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W13	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W16	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan	M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.	M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
			M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
			M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
			M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O. P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
			M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
			M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
			M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2267.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 224/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/410/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S. O. 2267.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 224/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/410/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer**ANNEXURE****BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT**K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer****Industrial Dispute No. 224/2004****(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 123/99)**

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri D. Varadarajan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/410/98-IR(B-I) dated 10-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 123/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 224/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri D. Varadarajan, wait list No. 479 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as Guindy branch from 2-1-1986. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Guindy branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 2-1-1986, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Guindy branch,

another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank.

The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Redefinition which resulted in five settlements dated 17-1-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 479 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categories as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 246 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 479 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and a binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements

of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91, it is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 479 for restoring the wait list of

temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for

appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further,

according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's

work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Exts. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Exts. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Exts. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial

Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement

entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was waitlisted and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been

arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is "whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?" The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held

that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in *Express Newspapers P. Ltd.* case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 *Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion

of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned

directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual

wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. it has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the

settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore.”

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me, in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri D. Varadarajan

WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : W1 Sri C. Mariappan

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messengers posts.
W7	25-02-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	16-06-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.

Ex. No.	Date	Description	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W10	21-08-91	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W29	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W11	3-11-92	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W30	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W12	6-12-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	For the Respondent/Management:		
W13	16-3-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W14	18-3-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W15	30-11-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W16	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care and service conditions.	M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.	M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W18	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W19	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
W20	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
W21	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.	M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
W22	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.	M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
W23	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.	M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
W24	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.	M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.
W25	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.	नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007		
W26	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.	का. आ. 2268.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ पोस्ट मास्टर, डाक विभाग के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, पटना के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।		
W27	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.	[सं. एल-40012/136/2004-आई आर (डी. यू.)] सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी		
W28	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.	New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007		

S. O. 2268.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Patna as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Post Maser/D/O Post and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-40012/136/2004-IR (DU)]
SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, SHRAM BHAWAN, BAILEY ROAD, PATNA****Reference No. 21 of 2005****No. 4 (C) of 2005**

Between the management of the Chief Post Master, General Post Office, Patna, Bihar and their workman Shri Shashi Bhushan, C/o Shri Yogendra Singh, Dr. Fani Bhushan Lane, Anishabad, Patna.

For the Management : Sri Gopal Mishra, P. A. Court Case, Patna, G. P. O., Patna

For the Workman : Shri B. Prasad, Joint Convener, Coordination of Unions & Associations, Patna

PRESENT

Vasudeo Ram, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Patna.

AWARD

Patna, dated the 11th July, 2007

By adjudication order No. L-40012/136/2004-IR(DU) dated the 28th January, 2005 the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'the Act' for brevity) referred the following dispute between the management of the Chief Post Master, General Post Office, (hereinafter called the GPO for brevity), Patna and their workman Shri Shashi Bhushan, C/o Shri Yogendra Singh, Dr. Fani Bhushan Lane, Anishabad, Patna to Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 2 for adjudication on the following :

"Whether the action of the management of Chief Post Master, GPO, Patna in terminating the services of workman Shri Shashi Bhushan instead of regularising him on completing 240 days of continuous service in each calendar year for more than four years in the Main G.P.O., O/o the Chief Post Master, Patna, Bihar is legal and justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

Subsequently vide adjudication order No. L-40012/136/2004-IR(DU) dated the 4th March, 2005 the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi in exercise of power conferred by Section 7A read with sub-section (1) of Section 33B of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947 withdrew the proceeding from Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 2 and transferred the same to this Tribunal to dispose of the same in accordance with the law.

2. The parties have filed the statement of claim and the written statement. The case of the workman is that he (Shri Shashi Bhushan) was orally appointed by the

management of G. P. O., Patna on 3-2-2001 to discharge the duties of a Peon. After his appointment he performed the duties of a Peon such as (1) sorting of return vouchers, (2) sorting of vouchers for posting, (3) putting date stamp on postal stamps, (4) putting stamp on postal orders, (5) sweeping, carrying postal bags, serving water, tea to the staff etc. He worked from 10 A. M. to 5 P. M. sometimes even beyond that for which extra payment was made. Initially he used to be paid @ Rs. 30 per day which was subsequently enhanced to Rs. 40 per day and lastly @ Rs. 60 per day. He was paid his wages through vouchers, generally on weekly basis. Further, the case of the workman is that he served the management continuously for more than 240 days each year when his services was abruptly terminated by the management on 30-4-2004. He was not given any notice, notice pay or retrenchment compensation prior to termination of his services as required under Section 25F of the Act and thus the management resorted to unfair labour practice as per schedule V of the Act. According to the workman the action of the management in not regularising his services as a Peon and terminating his services is illegal and unjustified. The workman claims that he be reinstated with full back wages and his services be regularised as a Peon besides any other relief deemed fit.

3. The contention of the management is that Shri Shashi Bhushan was not appointed against any vacant post. He was not given any appointment letter. The work from him was taken on purely temporary basis on part time daily wages whenever the necessity arose and he was paid according to the rate for daily wagers fixed by the Government. The workman was paid on hand receipts for the days he worked. The workman had not put in 'continuous service' as defined under Section 25B of the Act. According to the management Shri Shashi Bhushan does not come under the definition of 'workman' as defined under Section 2(S) of the Act. Further, according to the management since Shri Shashi Bhushan was not appointed by the management, the question of termination of his service did not arise. According to the management Shri Shashi Bhushan is not entitled to any relief claimed.

4. Upon the pleadings of the parties and also the terms of reference the following points arise out for decisions :—

- (i) Whether the action of the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna in terminating the services of workman Shri Shashi Bhushan instead of regularising him on completing 240 days of continuous service in each calendar year for more than four years in the Main G. P. O. Office of the Chief Post Master, Bihar is legal and justified?
- (ii) To what relief or reliefs, if any, the workman is entitled?

FINDINGS:**Point No. (i) :**

5. Both the parties have adduced oral as well as documentary evidence in support of their respective

contentions. The management has examined altogether five witnesses namely Shri Awadhesh Kumar Singh, Asstt. Post Master, Patna G. P. O. (M. W. 1), Shri Shibnath Prasad, Assistant in Patna G. P. O. (M. W. 2), Shri Basant Singh, retired Dy. Post Master, Mail and Treasury, Patna G. P. O. (M. W. 3), Md. Saifur Hassan, Assistant Post Master Patna G. P. O. (M. W. 4) and Ali Abbas, Manager, Postal Stores Depot, Patna (M. W. 5). Shashi Bhushan, the workman alone has deposed for himself. The management has got exhibited the photo copy of as many as 58 vouchers (Ext. M, M/2 to M/6), signature of Basant Singh (M. W. 3) on vouchers (Ext. M/9 and M/10), notings of Shibnath Prasad (M. W. 2) on error book (Exts. M/7 and M/8), notings of Ali Abbas (M. W. 5) on error book (Ext. M/13), initial of Basant Singh, (M. W. 3) on error book (Ext. M/11) and the signature of Md. Saifur Hasan (M. W. 4) on pay order (Ext. M/12). The management through the statement of its witnesses and the documents noted above has tried to prove that there was no vacancy of IV Grade under the management of G. P. O., Patna. Neither any name was called for to make appointment nor Shashi Bhushan was given any appointment letter by the management. Further the management has tried to impress upon that the order is taken on Error Book whenever the necessity to engage a Coolie arose, the Coolie was engaged thereon and after the work he was paid on vouchers (Form ACG-17). The vouchers are not the proof of appointment nor the same are pay bill through which the regular employees under the management are paid their wages. The aforesaid vouchers are issued by the management for casual expenses such as purchasing something from market, making payment to Coolies, Painter, Thelawala, Rickshaw Puller and such other persons.

6. The workman Shri Shashi Bhushan has filed a list of the days he worked under the management prepared by himself (Ext. W), photo copy of order book from 8-5-2002 to 31-8-2003 (Ext. W/1), photo copy of vouchers 67 pages (Ext. W/2) to (W/2-66). The said vouchers also include the 58 vouchers (Exts. M, M/2 to M/6) filed by the management. The workman through the said documents wanted to show that he worked as daily rated casual labour and he was paid @ Rs. 30 per day, lateron @ Rs. 40 per day and lastely @ Rs. 60 per day and in that way he served the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna for more than 240 days for several years. Besides that the workman has filed the photocopy of his matriculation certificate, School Leaving Certificate and the mark sheet (Ext. W/3) to show that he has the requisite qualification also to be appointed on the post of Grade IV.

7. From the terms of reference it is clear that the point as to whether the workman has worked under the management of the Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna continuously for 240 days in a calendar year is not in controversy rather in the terms of reference it is an admitted fact that the workman has worked under the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna continuously for 240 days in a calendar year for several calendar years. There can be no dispute on the point that this Tribunal has to adjudicate as per the terms of reference and can not go

beyond it. In the decision reported in 1979—Lab. I. C.—827 (Supreme Court) it has been held :

“The jurisdiction of Tribunal in industrial dispute is limited to the points specifically referred for adjudication and to matters incidental thereto and the Tribunal cannot go beyond the terms of reference. Where the very terms of reference showed that the point in dispute between the parties was not the fact of closure of its business by the employers and the reference were limited to the narrow question as to whether the closure was proper and justified, the Tribunal by the very terms of the reference had no jurisdiction to go behind the fact of closure and inquire into the question whether the business was infact closed down by the management.”

The terms of reference in this case shows that the point for adjudication is that on completing 240 days of continuous service in each calendar year for more than four years in the main G. P. O., Office of the Chief Post Master, Patna wheither the action of the Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna in terminating the services of workman Shri Shashi Bhushan instead of regularising him is legal and justified ? Under the circumstances I find that this Tribunal is not required to adjudicate as to whether the workman has worked under the management of the Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna for 240 days continuously in a calendar year for several years or not, this Tribunal is required to adjudicate as to whether the action of the Chief Post Master G. P. O., Patna in terminating the services of Shri Shashi Bhushan instead of regularising him is legal and justified or not. Under the circumstances I need not discuss the evidence adduced on behalf of the parties on the point whether the workman worked under the management continuously for 240 days in a calendar year or not.

8. Section 2(S) of the Act defined ‘workman’ as follows :

“ ‘Workman’ means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied and for the purpose of any proceeding under the Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence or, that dispute or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person :—

- (i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or
- (ii) who is employed in the Police Service or as an Officer or other employee of a prison; or
- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or

- (iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature”.

Looking into the said definition there remains no doubt that Shri Shashi Bhushan is a workman. He has worked under the management 240 days continuously in a calendar year for several calendar years. It is immaterial that there was no vacancy under the management, he was not given any appointment letter and he was paid wages through vouchers and not through paybill. The contention of the workman is that his services was abruptly terminated on 30-4-2004 without any notice, notice pay or compensation. The workman (M. W. 1) in his statement before this Tribunal has supported the same. Section 2(00) of the Act has defined retrenchment as follows :

“retrenchment” means the termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, but does not include :

- (a) voluntary retirement of a workman, or
- (b) retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation if the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned contains a stipulation in that behalf; or
- (bb) termination of the service of the workman as a result of the non-renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned as its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation on that behalf contained therein ; or
- (c) termination of the service of a workman on the ground of continued ill health.

The facts of this case shows that after taking ‘continuous service’ as defined under sub-clause (II) of clause (a) of Sub-section (2) of Section 25F of the Act i.e. after taking 240 days work in a calendar year for several years the services of the workman has been terminated without any reason and thus it is a clear case of retrenchment.

9. Section 25F of the Act speaks as follows :

“Condition precedent to retrenchment of workman—No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by the employer until :

- (a) the workman has been given one month’s notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;

- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government by notification in the official gazette.”

In the instant case the workman Shri Shashi Bhushan has been retrenched by the management of the Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna without making compliance of the provisions laid down under Section 25F of the Act; meaning thereby the workman was neither given any notice one month prior to his retrenchment nor notice pay or compensation was paid to him. Under the circumstances I find that the action of the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna in terminating the services of workman Shri Shashi Bhushan instead of regularising him on completing 240 days of continuous service in each calendar year for more than four years in the main G. P. O. Office of the Chief Post Master, Patna, Bihar is neither legal nor justified. This point is decided accordingly.

Point No. (ii) :

10. The decision in the case of Dhampur Sugar Mills Ltd. Vs. Bhola Singh reported in AIR—2005—Supreme Court—1970 has been cited and it has been argued on behalf of the management that completion of 240 days service in a calendar year in itself is not a ground for directing regularisation particularly in a case when the workman has not been appointed in accordance with the extant rules. Para 18 of the decision speaks as follows :

“When a workman is appointed in terms of a Scheme on daily wages, he does not derive any legal right to be regularised. It is now well known that completion of 240 days of continuous service in a year may not by itself be a ground for directing regularisation particularly in a case when the workman had not been appointed in accordance with the extant rules.”

In the said case the workman was appointed under the Scheme, the workman had worked as a trainee/apprentice under a Scheme sponsored by the State Government for training the cane growers. Under the circumstances I find that the case cited on behalf of the management differs from the present case and the decision reported in AIR—2005—Supreme Court—1970 does not apply in this case.

11. From the evidence on record it transpires that Shri Shashi Bhushan (W. W. 1) has contended and has stated in his statement before this Tribunal that he did the works which a regular IV Grade employee of the G. P. O. did and the same has not been falsified by the management. The management has neither contended nor proved that the office of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna is a temporary office. It is a permanent office and it is likely to continue for indefinite period. The workman has worked under the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna for 240 days continuously in one calendar year for several years.

The workman has been illegally retrenched. Under the circumstances I find that workman deserves to be reinstated on the post of peon under the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna. I may mention that the management has not taken any work from the workman after 30-4-2004 and the workman had worked upto that date as a peon which is not a skilled or specialised work so that the workman might not have got any engagement after 30-4-2004. Under the circumstances I am not inclined to allow back wages. This point is decided accordingly.

12. In the result I find and hold that the action of the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna in terminating the services of workman Shri Shashi Bhushan instead of regularising him on completing 240 days of continuous service in each calendar year for more than four years in the main G. P. O. Office of the Chief Post Master, Patna, Bihar is neither legal nor justified. The workman Shri Shashi Bhushan deserves to be reinstated on the post of a peon under the management of Chief Post Master, G. P. O., Patna. The management is directed to reinstate the workman within two months from the date of publication of award.

13. And this is my Award.

VASUDEO RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2269.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 198/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/355/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S. O. 2269.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 198/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/355/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 198/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 21/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri R. Kumar : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sunder, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/355/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 21/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-Cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 198/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri R. Kumar, wait list No. 385 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Ponneri branch from 17-9-1982. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached

between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Ponneri branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 17-9-1982, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Ponneri branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to

the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 385 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days

aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 385 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait

listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are:—

(i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 385 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

(ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point Nos. 1 & 2:

8. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it is reported by the representative of the Petitioner that he is not appearing for the Petitioner and the Petitioner also has not appeared before this Court for further proceedings and hence, the Petitioner was called absent and set ex parte.

9. In this case, the Petitioner alleged that he was appointed by Respondent/Bank during 1982 and worked as a temporary messenger and during the year 1986-87 he was disengaged from service and again he was engaged as a temporary messenger and all of a sudden, on 31-3-97 he was terminated from service without any notice or notice of compensation. Since he has continuously worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months, he is entitled to the benefits of Section 25F of the I. D. Act. But, no evidence was adduced on behalf of the Petitioner nor produced any document to establish his contention. The Petitioner has not appeared before this Tribunal to substantiate his claim. As such, I find the allegations of the Petitioner are not established before this Tribunal. Hence, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

10. Thus, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

(Dictated to the P. A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007).

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2270.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 68/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/368/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S. O. 2270.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 68/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/368/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 68/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 90/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri K. Manthirasoodamani : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Madurai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : Mr. D. Mukundan, Advocate

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/368/98-IR(B-I) dated 5-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 90/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-Cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 68/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri K. Manthirasoodamani, wait list No. 381 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as at Sattur branch from 27-5-1983. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Sattur branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 27-5-1983, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometimes performing work in other branches also. While

working on temporary basis in Sattur branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Sections 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of

law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 381 in wait list of Zonal Office, Madurai. So far 219 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 492 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 492 wait listed candidates, 219 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 381 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements

were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are—

(i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 381 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

(ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point Nos. 1 & 2 :

8. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it is reported by the representative of the Petitioner that he is not appearing for the Petitioner and the Petitioner also has not appeared before this Court for further proceedings and hence, the Petitioner was called absent and set ex parte.

9. In this case, the Petitioner alleged that he was appointed by Respondent/Bank during 1983 and worked as a temporary messenger and during the year 1986-87 he was disengaged from service and again he was engaged as a temporary messenger and all of a sudden, on 31-3-97 he was terminated from service without any notice or notice of compensation. Since he has continuously worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months, he is entitled to the benefits of Section 25F of the I. D. Act. But, no evidence was adduced on behalf of the Petitioner nor produced any document to establish his contention. The Petitioner has not appeared before this Tribunal to substantiate his claim. As such, I find the allegations of the Petitioner are not established before this Tribunal. Hence, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

10. Thus, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

(Dictated to the P. A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this day the 31st January, 2007).

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2271.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 86/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/40/1999-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S.O. 2271.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 86/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/40/1999-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 86/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 260/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri S. Ganesan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
 Manager,
 State Bank of India, Z. O.,
 Madurai.

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekanbaram,
 Authorised Representative

For the Management : Mr. B. Rajendran, Advocate

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/40/99-IR(B-I) dated 10-5-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 260/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-Cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 86/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri S. Ganesan wait list No. 221 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified ? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled ?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical

examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Nilakottai branch from 04-01-1979. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Nilakottai branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 4-1-1979, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometimes performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Nilakottai branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular

service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Sections 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 221 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Madurai. So far 219 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 492 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed.

Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 492 wait listed candidates, 219 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 221 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the

Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in merial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 221 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point Nos. 1 & 2 :

8. When the matter was taken up for hearing, it is reported by the representative of the Petitioner that he is not appearing for the Petitioner and the Petitioner also has not appeared before this Court for further proceedings and hence, the Petitioner was called absent and set ex parte.

9. In this case, the Petitioner alleged that he was appointed by Respondent/Bank during 1979 and worked as a temporary messenger and during the year 1986-87 he was disengaged from service and again he was engaged as a temporary messenger and all of a sudden, on 31-3-97 he was terminated from service without any notice or notice of compensation. Since he has continuously worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months, he is entitled to the benefits of Section 25F of the I. D. Act. But no evidence was adduced on behalf of the Petitioner nor produced any document to establish his contention. The Petitioner has not appeared before this Tribunal to substantiate his claim. As such, I find the allegations of the Petitioner are not established before this

Tribunal. Hence, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No Costs.

10. Thus, the reference is disposed of accordingly.

(Dictated to the P. A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007).

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2272.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 223/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/377/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S. O. 2272.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 223/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/377/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 223/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 98/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri P. Pushparaj : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/377/98-IR(B-I) dated 5-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 98/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 223/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri P. Pushparaj, wait list No. 487 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Guindy branch from 2-1-1986. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Guindy branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 2-1-1986, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While

working on temporary basis in Guindy branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I.D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of

law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 484 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 484 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements

were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

(i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 487 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

(ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees

at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter VA of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88

and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belong to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners

were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and other wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to

voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he

was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K. C. P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the

contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the Federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan

Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. Service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such

circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and

subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the

Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days

of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy

decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident. I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri P. Pushparaj
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	16-07-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.
W10	05-09-91	Xerox copy of the service certificate given by Guindy branch of Respondent/Bank.
W11	17-03-92	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by World University service centre branch.
W12	06-12-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy branch.
W13	30-03-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy branch.
W14	18-03-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy branch.
W15	10-11-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy branch.
W16	10-11-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy branch.
W17	30-11-85	Xerox copy of the interview letter from Respondent Bank.
W18	24-07-89	Xerox copy of the interview letter from Respondent Bank.
W19	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care and service conditions.
W20	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W21	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W22	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W23	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W24	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W25	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W26	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W27	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W28	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W29	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W30	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W31	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W32	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W33	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2273. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 229/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/430/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th July, 2007

S. O. 2273.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 229/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/430/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 229/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 128/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri E. Anandan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar,
Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/430/98-IR(B-I) dated 10-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 128/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 229/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri E. Anandan wait list No. 424 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Overseas branch from 28-06-1984. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Overseas branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 28-6-1984, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Overseas branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference

and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3)

of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 427 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 427 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there

is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 424 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms

of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others, the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/

Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come-first go' or 'first come-last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent

are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belong to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal Clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is

illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though Clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they

have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 *Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation* wherein the Supreme Court has held "that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was waitlisted as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was waitlisted and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 *Associated Glass*

Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 *Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and others* wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 *K. C. P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 *National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the

federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between

the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and

therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 11 SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an

irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 *Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi*, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also

held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. it has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, and since they have not questioned the

wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri E. Anandan
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengersial work.
W9	14-10-85	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W10	21-01-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W11	23-10-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W12	23-10-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding appointment of temporary employees.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W14	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W16	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W17	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W18	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W19	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W20	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W21	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W22	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W23	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W24	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W25	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W26	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W27	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2274. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 206/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/342/1998-अई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2274.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 206/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/342/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 206/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 29/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri V. Senguttuvan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/342/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 29/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 206/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri V. Senguttuvan, wait list No. 393 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Guindy branch from 7-12-1981. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Guindy branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally

to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 7-12-1981, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Guindy Airport branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise.

The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No.393 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 393 he was not appointed. The said settlements

were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the

Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 393 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the

Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others, the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come-first go' or 'first come-last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was

prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wagger in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India. Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belong to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though

the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badli' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5.

Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was waitlisted as per

length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was waitlisted and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 11 LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair

in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being goodwill between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is, whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on

the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, Pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative

merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees

who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable". Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the

services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 *Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi*, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. it has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 *National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh*, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 *Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar*, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 *Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only

because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in similar cases this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme

Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri V. Senguttuvan

WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Manappan

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily <i>Thanthi</i> based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in <i>The Hindu</i> on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in <i>The Hindu</i> extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	26-2-85	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.
W10	1-4-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.
W11	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care & service conditions.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W13	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W16	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W17	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W18	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W19	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W20	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W21	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W22	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W24	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W25	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2275.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 202/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/338/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2275.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 202/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/338/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT**K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer****Industrial Dispute No. 202/2004****(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 25/99)**

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri M. Arokia Das : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K.S. Sundar, Advocate

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/338/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 25/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 202/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri M. Arokia Das, wait list No. 566 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical

examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Raja Annamalai Puram branch. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Raja Annamalai Puram branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. The Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in West Manbalam branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular

service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Sections 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 562 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under

the settlement, employees were categories as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 562 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other Class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the

Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 566 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been

marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last

come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary Class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India'. Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of

casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(o) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the

respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted

their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority

union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the

Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 *Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. Service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for

reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to

exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of adhoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant

rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent, was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S. C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into

between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri M. Arockia Dass
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	09-03-87	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by R. A. Puram branch.
W10	19-08-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by R. A. Puram branch.
W11	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate care and service conditions.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W13	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W16	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W17	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W18	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W19	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W20	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W21	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W22	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W24	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W25	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2276.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 205/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/341/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2276.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 205/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/341/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 205/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 28/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri G. Sivaraj : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/341/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 28/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 205/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri G. Sivaraj wait list No. 706 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as Thiruvallur Main branch from 8-10-1982. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Thiruvallur Main Branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 18-10-1982, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometimes performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Thiruvallur

Main branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Sections 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank.

The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was waitlisted as candidate No. 700 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categories as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 700, he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements

were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 706 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service

exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively.

But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended to behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their

appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal Clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though Clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he was arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001

and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc." It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business

exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 ILLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 308 K. C. P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering

Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being goodwill between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal

cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and

discriminatory. He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus, misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a backdoor; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow

irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one; From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment, therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the

subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim

regularisation of reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri G. Sivaraj

WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messengers posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W9	1982-83	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvallur branch.
W10	30-12-04	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Thiruvallur main branch.
W11	27-06-89	Xerox copy of the interview letter received from Thiruvallur branch.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal office for interview of messenger post-V. Muralikannan.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal office for interview of messenger post-K. Subburaj.
W16	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal office for interview of messenger post-J. Velmurugan.
W17	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W18	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W19	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W20	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W21	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W22	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W24	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W25	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W26	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W. A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2277.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 209/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/309/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2277.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 209/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/309/1998-IR (B-1)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 209/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 47/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri M. Jayakumar : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India. Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative.

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/309/98-IR(B-1) dated 2-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 47/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 209/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri M. Jayakumar, wait list No. 516 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at West Mambalam branch from 20-10-1981. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before

Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the West Mambalam branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 21-10-1981, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometimes performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Kottur branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are

repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 513 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above,

cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categories as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 513 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by

employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 516 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years,

the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(2) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 240 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter VA of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched

workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in the regular/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, those persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given mere beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W.P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement

was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India. Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belong to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal Clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed

the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though Clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 and W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The

Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per

length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised

majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty

and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been

exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 *Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy". In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means

that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a backdoor; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable". Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption

in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment, therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further,

the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S. C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either

the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident. I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri M. Jayakumar
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	23-01-82	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by West Mambalam Branch.
W10	21-09-83	Xerox copy of the service certificate given by West Mambalam Branch of Respondent/Bank.
W11	17-07-91	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by T. Nagar Branch.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by West Mambalam Branch.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Besant Nagar Branch.
W14	23-03-94	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Besant Nagar Branch.
W15	10-10-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by T. Nagar Branch.
W16	10-09-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Saidapet Branch.
W17	10-09-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Saidapet Branch.
W18	27-01-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Saidapet Branch.
W19	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Triplicane Branch.
W20	27-10-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Kottur Branch.
W21	28-10-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Nandambakkam Branch.
W22	20-02-99	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Saidapet Bazaar Branch.
W23	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre & service conditions.
W24	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W25	25-01-05	Xerox copy of the letter given by Petitioner to Besant Nagar branch for service certificate.
W26	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W27	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W28	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W29	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W30	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W31	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sni G. Pandi.
W32	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W33	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W34	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W35	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W36	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W37	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W38	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

AWARD

का. आ. 2278.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 208/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/344/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2278.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 208/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/344/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 208/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 31/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri M. Chandrasekar : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sunder, Advocates

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/344/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 31/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 208/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri M. Chandrasekar, wait list No. 496 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as Velachery branch from 17-9-1984. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under section 18(1) reached management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Velachery branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 17-9-1984, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Gopalapuram

branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank.

The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 496 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categories as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 496 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements

of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 496 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service

exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter VA of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come-first go' or 'first come-last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively.

But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India'. Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belong to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at

the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and other wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 waitlist has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it

was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/

Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 I LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings

reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being goodwill between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein

the Madhya Pradesh High court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. Service in an existing or a future vacancy". In that case, Pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which the Supreme Court has held that "in such

circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and

subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of an without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable". Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the

Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Sonvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days

of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service". The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy

decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri M. Chandrasekaran

WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	25-09-84	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Velacheri Branch.
W10	01-08-85	Xerox copy of the service certificate given by Saligramam branch of Respondent/Bank.
W11	08-08-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Naganallur branch.
W12	08-08-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Saligramam branch.
W13	29-04-89	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Anna Nagar Branch.
W14	06-07-89	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Nanganalur Branch.
W15	10-07-89	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Madras Harbour Branch.
W16	27-06-90	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town Branch.
W17	21-07-90	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Anna Nagar Branch.
W18	25-10-91	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town Branch.
W19	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.
W20	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W21	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W22	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W23	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velumurugan.
W24	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velumurugan.
W25	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W26	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W27	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W28	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W29	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W30	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the vipartite meeting.
W31	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W32	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W33	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

AWARD

का. आ. 2279.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 203/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/339/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S.O. 2279.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 203/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/339/1998-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 203/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 26/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri M. Ovia : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/339/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 26/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 203/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri M. Ovia, wait list No. 485 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as IIT Chennai branch from 4-9-1981. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the IIT Chennai branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 4-9-1981, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometimes performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in IIT Chennai

branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank.

The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I.D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 483 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 waitlisted candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was waitlisted at 483 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements

of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are:—

(i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 485 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"

(ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1:

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service

exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come'—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when

MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so-called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India'. Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Article 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these Petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their

appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principle clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Exts. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Exts. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Exts. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001

and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid Holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 11 LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business

exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned Counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering

Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned Counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal

cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. Service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, Pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and

discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists", and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow

irrespective of an without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. it has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the

subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim

regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri M. Ovia

WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily <i>Thanthi</i> based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in <i>The Hindu</i> on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in <i>The Hindu</i> extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W9	25-07-83	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by IIT Chennai branch.
W10	07-01-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate given by Guindy branch.
W11	19-2-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by IIT Chennai branch.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on Staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.
W13	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W16	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai Zonal Office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W17	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W18	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W19	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W20	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W21	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W22	9-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W24	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W25	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W26	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2280.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 207/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/343/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2280.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 207/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/343/1998-IR (B-1)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT**K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer****Industrial Dispute No. 207/2004****(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 30/99)**

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri G. Kamalanathan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Officer,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/343/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 30/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 207/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri G. Kamalanathan, wait list No. 482 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment

as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as Guindy branch from 4-1-86. During 1985-86 the Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of Guindy. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 4-1-86, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working as such, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working at Thousand light branch, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular

service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 482 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed.

Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 482, he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the

Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W.P. No. 7172 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are:—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Writ No. 482 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (Civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been

marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Sections 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Exts. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last

come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals.

Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended to behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(o) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the

respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he was arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modifications of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Exts. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted

their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority

union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the

Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 *Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for

reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to

exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant

rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. it has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujapur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into

between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bonafide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of malafide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri G. Kamalanathan

WW2 Sri V. S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri R. Subramaniam

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	Nil	Xerox copy of the Orissa High Court judgement in OJC No. 2787/97.
W10	Nil	Xerox copy of the Supreme Court Order in SLP CC 3061/99.
W11	30-11-85	Xerox copy of the letter from Respondent/Bank directing the Petitioner to attend interview, as sponsored by Employment Exchange.
W12	26-12-85	Xerox copy of the letter from Respondent/Bank to Petitioner regarding filling up of vacancy of Substitute messenger.
W13	21-07-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued to Petitioner.
W14	11-01-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued to Petitioner.
W15	Nil	Xerox copy of administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank regarding appointment of temporary Employees.
W16	31-12-95	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.

Ex. No.	Date	Description	For the Respondent/Management :
W17	Nil	Xerox copy of the Vol. III of Reference book on staff matters upto 31-12-95.	Ex. No. Date Description
W18	Nil	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/1991.	M1 17-11-87 Xerox copy of the settlement.
W19	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in WMP No. 11932 of 91 in W.P. 7872 of 91 granting interim injunction.	M2 16-07-88 Xerox copy of the settlement.
W20	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M3 27-10-88 Xerox copy of the settlement.
W21	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M4 09-01-91 Xerox copy of the settlement.
W22	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.	M5 30-07-96 Xerox copy of the settlement.
W23	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.	M6 09-06-95 Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
W24	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.	M7 28-05-91 Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
W25	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.	M8 15-05-98 Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
W26	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.	M9 10-07-99 Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
W27	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.	M10 Nil Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
W28	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.	नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007
W29	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.	का. आ. 2281.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 218/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।
W30	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.	[सं. एल-12012/348/1998-आई आर (बी-1)] अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी
W31	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.	New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007
W32	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.	S. O. 2281.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 218/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/348/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 218/2004**(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 56/99)**

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri C. Subramaniam : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sunder, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/348/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 56/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I.D. No. 218/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

"Whether the demand of the workman Shri C. Subramaniam, wait list No. 419 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Mannady branch from 1-6-1984. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a

copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Mannady branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 1-6-1984, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and sometimes performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Jawahar Nagar branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding

grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 516 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 waitlisted temporary candidates, out of 744 waitlisted temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service

in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 516 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank

deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workmen with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 419 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed

for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters,

copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wagers in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per

instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/

Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Exs. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Exs. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Exs. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they

find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned Counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 II LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional

cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned Counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bonafide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/

Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 *Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. Service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 *Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those adhoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference

to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every adhoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an adhoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of an without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on adhoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working

on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Any how, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if

the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or

other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the Petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri C. Subramaniam
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	24-05-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Mannady Branch.
W10	15-07-89	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Shastri Nagar Branch.
W11	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre & service conditions.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W13	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W14	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W15	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W16	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W17	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W18	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W19	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W20	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W21	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W22	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W23	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W24	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W25	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2282.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक

अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 219/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/347/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2282.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 219/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/347/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 219/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 57/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri P. N. Gunaseelan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. Veeramani, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/347/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 57/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and counter statement respectively.

After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 219/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri P. N. Gunaseelan, wait list No. 702 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as Overseas branch from 12-11-1985. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Overseas branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 12-11-1985, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Overseas branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure,

the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and

when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 782 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 782 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto

31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 702 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified ?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter VA of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Sections 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme

Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Exts. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come-first go' or 'first come-last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Exts. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in

which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belong to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, its wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative

of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Ex. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits

under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held "that the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was waitlisted as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was waitlisted and therefore,

the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 I LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 ILLJ 308 K. C. P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for

adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express

Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vjeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy." In that case, Pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on

6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 *Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable." Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs.*

State of Bihar and Others wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 *Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi*, the Supreme Court has held that "merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not

made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. it has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner

has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri P.N. Gunaseelan

WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan

MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex.No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messengers posts.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.
W9	12-05-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W10	16-06-88	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W11	20-01-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W12	21-01-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W13	23-10-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.
W14	26-07-89	Xerox copy of the call letter for interview from the Respondent/Bank.
W15	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.
W16	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W17	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W18	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W19	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W20	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W21	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W22	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W23	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W24	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W25	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office Circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W26	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W27	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W28	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W29	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office Circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2283.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 204/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/340/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2283.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 204/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/340/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer**ANNEXURE****BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT**K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer****Industrial Dispute No. 204/2004****(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 27/99)**

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri S. Kumar : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCEFor the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/340/98-IR(B-I) dated 3-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 27/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-Cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 204/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows :—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri S. Kumar wait list No. 386 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical

examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Park Town branch from 10-1-1981. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under section 18(1) reached between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Park Town branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 10-1-1983, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in HO Chennai branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular

service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 386 in waitlist of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed.

Under the settlement, employees were categories as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 386 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the waited list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the

Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 386 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified ?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been

marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenchment as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under Section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Section 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Sanyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I.D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Ex. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come—first go' or 'first

come—last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Ex. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so-called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wager in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combing equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals.

Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H. D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the

respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Exs. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W.P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to Voluntary Retirement Scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Section 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I.Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that the "expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc." It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted

their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of the I.D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned Counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 11 LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority

union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K.C.P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlements are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement has reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned Counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the

Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. Service in an existing or a future vacancy. In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for

reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad-hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad-hoc temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a back door; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an ad-hoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of an without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on ad-hoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to

exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of adhoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant

rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioner's cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioner has made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into

between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioner has not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of malafide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioner cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioner cannot claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar case, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioner is entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri S. Kumar
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram
For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.	W20	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.	W21	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on Staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.	W22	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.	W23	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W24	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurugan.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messengers posts.	W25	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurugan.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.	W26	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menial—G. Pandi.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W27	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W9	21-03-84	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town Branch.	W28	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W10	15-05-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town branch.	W29	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W11	13-01-92	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town branch.	W30	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding Norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W12	Nil	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town branch.	W31	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W13	15-04-93	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Saligramam branch.	W32	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W14	07-02-94	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by LHO OA Deptt. branch.	W33	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W15	10-07-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Park Town Branch.	W34	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W16	21-12-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Overseas Branch.			
W17	24-06-98	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by LHO OA Deptt.			
W18	24-06-98	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by LHO OA Deptt.			
W19	06-07-89	Xerox copy of the interview letter from Respondent/Bank.			

For the Respondent/Management :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2007

का. आ. 2284.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 212/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-7-2007 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/312/1998-आई आर (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2007

S. O. 2284.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 212/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-7-2007.

[No. L-12012/312/1998-IR (B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 31st January, 2007

PRESENT

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 212/2004

(Principal Labour Court CGID No. 50/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen]

BETWEEN

Sri K. Murugan : I Party/Petitioner

AND

The Assistant General : II Party/Management
Manager,
State Bank of India, Z. O.,
Chennai

APPEARANCE

For the Petitioner : Sri V. S. Ekambaram,
Authorised Representative

For the Management : M/s. K. S. Sundar, Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-12012/312/98-IR(B-I) dated 2-2-1999 has referred this dispute earlier to the Tamil Nadu Principal Labour Court, Chennai and the said Labour Court has taken the dispute on its file as CGID No. 50/99 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides entered appearance and filed their claim statement and Counter Statement respectively. After the constitution of this CGIT-cum-Labour Court, the said dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication and this Tribunal has numbered it as I. D. No. 212/2004.

2. The Schedule mentioned in that order is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workman Shri K. Murugan, wait list No. 553 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of State Bank of India and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified? If so, to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

3. The allegations of the Petitioner in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows:—

The Petitioner was sponsored by Employment Exchange for the post of sub-staff in Class IV cadre in State Bank of India and he was given appointment as messenger after an interview and medical examination. He was appointed on temporary basis at Guindy branch from 7-4-1984. The Petitioner was orally informed that his services were no more required. The non-employment of the Petitioner and others became subject matter before Supreme Court in the form of Writ Petition filed by State Bank Employees' Union in Writ Petition No. 542/87 which was taken up by the Supreme Court. The Respondent/Bank, in addition to its counter, filed a copy of settlement under Section 18(1) reached

between management of State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the settlement is with regard to absorption of Class IV temporary workmen who were denied employment after 1985-86 were classified in the settlement was under consideration once again and they classified the workmen under three categories namely A, B and C. Though the classification was unreasonable, the Respondent/Bank brought to the notice of the Petitioner about the interview to be held through advertisements. The Petitioner also submitted his application in the prescribed format through Branch Manager of the Guindy branch. He was called for an interview by a Committee appointed by Respondent/Bank in this regard. But, they have not informed the result of interview and also with regard to appointment. But, the Petitioner was informed orally to join at the branch where he initially worked as a class IV employee. From 7-4-1984, the Petitioner has been working as a temporary messenger and some times performing work in other branches also. While working on temporary basis in Guindy branch, another advertisement by the Respondent/Bank was made regarding casual workers who were reported to be in service during the same period. While the Petitioner was working as such, the Manager of the branch informed the Petitioner orally on 31-3-97 that his services are not required any more and he need not attend the office from 1-4-97. Hence, the Petitioner raised a dispute with regard to his non-employment. Since the conciliation ended in failure, the matter was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Though reference was sent to this Tribunal, the reference framed did not satisfy the grievance of the Petitioner, he has made a fresh representation to Govt. to reconsider the reference and the Petitioner requested the Respondent/Bank to continue to engage him in service as obtained prior to 31-3-97 and to regularise him in service in due course. The Respondent/Bank took up an unreasonable stand that the service and the number of days worked by Petitioner were treated as of no consequence, since according to the Respondent/Bank, it engaged the Petitioner only in temporary services after the settlement. The Petitioner was not aware of settlement by which his services and number of days worked by him after interview do not merit consideration. The Petitioner was not a party to the settlement mentioned by the Respondent/Bank before the conciliation officer. Therefore, the Respondent's action in not absorbing him in regular service is unjust and illegal. Further, the settlements are repugnant to Section 25G and 25H of the I. D. Act. The termination of the Petitioner is against the provisions of para 522(4) of Sastry Award. Even though the settlement speaks about three categories only a single wait list has been prepared and the Respondent/Bank has been regularising according to their whims and fancies. The Respondent/Bank has also not observed the instructions regarding grant of increments, leave, medical benefits etc. to

the temporary workmen which amounts to violation of relevant provisions of circular. The Respondent/Bank engaged the Petitioner and extracted the same work either by payment of petty cash or by directing him to work under assumed name or by both which amounts to unfair labour practice. The wait list suffers serious infirmities and it is not based on strict seniority and without any rationale. Hence, for all these reasons the Petitioner prays to grant relief of regular employment in Respondent/Bank with all attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in its Counter Statement alleged that reference made by the Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal itself is not maintainable. The Petitioner was not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise. The engagement of Petitioner was not authorised. The Petitioner is estopped from making claim as per Claim Statement. The settlement drawn under provisions of Section 18(1) and 18(3) of I. D. Act in lieu of provisions of law, retrenchment and implemented by Respondent/Bank. The claim of the Petitioner is not bona fide and made with ulterior motive. The Petitioner concealed the material facts that he was wait listed as per his length of engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in seniority. Due to the business exigency, the Respondent/Bank engaged the temporary employees for performance of duties as messenger and such engagements were prevailing from the year 1970 onwards. Such of those employees who are claiming permanent absorption and when their case was espoused by State Bank of India Staff Federation which resulted in five settlements dated 17-11-87, 16-7-88, 7-10-88, 9-1-91 and 30-7-96. The said settlements became subject matter of conciliation proceedings and minutes were drawn under Section 18(3) of I. D. Act. In terms thereof, the Petitioner was considered for permanent appointment as per his eligibility along with similarly placed other temporary employees and the Petitioner was wait listed as candidate No. 549 in wait list of Zonal Office, Chennai. So far 357 wait listed temporary candidates, out of 744 wait listed temporary employees were permanently appointed by Respondent/Bank. It is false to allege that the Petitioner worked as a temporary messenger. The Petitioner was engaged only in leave vacancies as and when it arose. When the Petitioner having submitted to selection process in terms of settlements drawn as per retrenchment provisions referred to above, cannot turn around and claim appointment. Such of those temporary employees who were appointed were engaged for more number of days and hence, they were appointed. Under the settlement, employees were categorised as A, B and C. Considering their temporary service and subject to other eligibility criteria, under category (A) the temporary employees who were engaged for 240 days were to be considered and under category (B) the temporary employees who have completed 270 days aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months and under category (C) the temporary employees who have completed 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1-7-75 or minimum 70 days

aggregate temporary service in any continuous block of 36 calendar months were to be considered. As per Clause 7, the length of temporary service was to be considered for seniority in the wait list and it was also agreed that wait list was to lapse in December, 1991 and the cut off date was extended upto 31-3-97 for filling up vacancies which were to arise upto 31-12-94. The Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment. The Respondent had implemented the voluntary retirement scheme and even the permanent vacancies stand substantially reduced. There were no regular vacancies available. The peculiar problem was due to the facts that all the aforesaid temporary employees were working in leave vacancies and not in regular permanent vacancies. In terms of aforesaid settlements, out of 744 wait listed candidates, 357 temporary employees were appointed and since the Petitioner was wait listed at 549 he was not appointed. The said settlements were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlements directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Further, the said settlements were not questioned by any union so far and the settlements of bank level settlements and operated throughout the country. The Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferral of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 does not apply to Respondent/Bank and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain such plea. It is not correct to say that documents and identity of Petitioner was verified before the Petitioner was engaged. It is also not correct to say that the Petitioner was discharging the work of permanent messenger. As per settlements, vacancies upto 31-12-94 were filled up against the wait list of temporary employees and vacancies for 1995-96 has to be filled up against the wait list drawn for appointment of daily wages/casual labour. Further, for circle of Chennai wait list of daily wages was not finalized and hence not published and there is only one wait list for the appointment of temporary employees. After the expiry of wait list, the Petitioner has no claim for permanent absorption. Hence, for all these reasons, the Respondent prays to dismiss the claim with costs.

5. In the additional claim statement, the Petitioner contended that he was having been sponsored by employment exchange and having undergone medical examination, the Petitioner has fulfilled the criteria set out by the Respondent/Bank for selection of candidate for appointment in the post of messenger and other class IV post. He was engaged in the messenger post in the subordinate cadre of the Respondent/Bank continuously with deliberate and artificial breaks. Therefore, the Respondent/Bank is duty bound to regularise the services of the Petitioner as he has acquired the valuable right enshrined in the Constitution of India. In the year 1998, the Respondent/Bank has issued a circular to the effect that under no circumstances, wait listed persons like the Petitioner be engaged even in menial category, thus, the Respondent/Bank imposed total ban for his future employment. Even though there were sufficient number of vacancies in class IV category, the Respondent/Bank deliberately delayed in filling up the vacancies by the wait

listed workman with ulterior motive. The Respondent/Bank has been arbitrarily filling up the vacancies with the persons other than wait listed workmen according to their whims and fancies. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

6. Again, the Petitioner filed a rejoinder to the Counter Statement of the Respondent, wherein it is stated all the settlements made by the bank with the State Bank of India Staff Federation were under Section 18(1) of the Act and not under Section 18(3) of the Act. As per recruitment rules of the Respondent/Bank, recruitment of class IV staff in the Respondent/Bank is in accordance with the instructions laid down under codified circulars of the Respondent/Bank. Even in the Writ Petition before the High Court in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, the Petitioner questioned the settlement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-91. It is false to allege that the settlements are contrary to the rights of the Petitioner. Hence, the Petitioner prays that an award may be passed in his favour.

7. In these circumstances, the points for my consideration are :—

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Petitioner in Wait List No. 553 for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?"
- (ii) "To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?"

Point No. 1 :

8. In this case, on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected industrial disputes have been sponsored by Employment Exchange and they having been called for interview and having been selected and wait listed in terms of the relevant guidelines/circulars of the Respondent/Bank in permanent vacancies in subordinate cadre on temporary basis. After engaging them intermittently for some years, the Petitioner in this case and other Petitioners in the connected disputes were terminated without any notice. Since the Respondent/Bank terminated several temporary employees in the year 1985, the State Bank Employees Union had filed a Writ Petition before the Supreme Court to protect the legal and constitutional rights of the workmen concerned and while the matter was pending in Writ Petition No. 542 (civil) 1987, the Respondent/Bank hurriedly entered into a settlement on the issue of absorption of temporary employees and filed it before the Supreme Court at the time of final hearing of the Writ Petition. This settlement has become an exhibit of the Respondent/Bank and has been marked as Ex. M1. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected cases attacked this settlement as it is not binding on them on the ground that they have been interviewed and selected in the permanent vacancy and Respondent/Bank without any intimation or notice denied an opportunity to work in the bank after 31-3-1997 and therefore, they have raised the dispute in the year 1997 before the labour authorities and they questioned the retrenched as unjust and illegal and they further prayed for reinstatement with back wages and other attendant benefits.

9. On behalf of the Petitioner, it is contended that these Petitioners were recruited as temporary employees in the Respondent/Bank under the guidelines and circulars issued by the Respondent/Bank from time to time and further, the same guidelines carry the procedure for regularisation of service of the temporary employees and any settlement in this regard is redundant and in any case, the Petitioner is not bound by settlement under section 18(1) entered into between the alleged Federation and the Respondent/Management. They further contended that though the Respondent/Bank has stated that the Petitioner has not worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and was not in continuous service on 17-11-1987, therefore, they have no valid and enforceable right for appointment, in the wake of strict instructions and circulars/guidelines issued by the Respondent/Bank to the effect that temporary employees at branches/offices are not allowed to be in service exceeding 200 days, hence the question of Petitioner working for 240 days does not arise at all. Further, they have invoked the relevant provisions of Chapter VA of the I. D. Act and it is preposterous to contend that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment as Sections 25G and 25H are very much applicable to the Petitioners who are retrenched messengers and are eligible to be reinstated. Learned representative for the Petitioner contended that in 1996 LAB and IC 2248 Central Bank of India Vs. S. Satyam and Others the Supreme Court has held that Chapter V-A of the I. D. Act providing for retrenchment is not enacted only for the benefit of the workmen to whom Section 25F applies but for all cases of retrenchment. Therefore, the application of Section 25H cannot be restricted only to one category of retrenched workmen. Therefore, the contention of the Respondent/Bank that the Petitioner has no valid and enforceable right for appointment is untenable. It is further contended that on behalf of the Petitioner that Exts. W2, W3 and W8 as well as Ex. M8 which constitute/relate to the circular instructions of the Respondent/Bank issued from time to time in connection with the implementation of the settlements on absorption and which are statutory in character. Further, a combined study of Ex. M1 and the averments of MW1 and MW2 and their testimonies during the cross-examination will clearly show how the bank has given a raw deal to the Petitioner from the beginning linking his future with the settlements. Further, Clause 1 of Ex. M1 deals with categorization of retrenched temporary employees into 'A, B and C', but this categorization of 'A, B and C' is quite opposed to the doctrine of 'last come-first go' or 'first come-last go' and therefore, the categorization in Clause 1 is illegal. Clause 1(a) of Ex. M1 provides an opportunity to persons who were engaged on casual basis and allowed to work in leave/casual vacancies of messengers, farashes, cash coolies, water boys, sweepers etc. for absorption along with the other eligible categories of temporary employees is not valid. Further, engaging casuals to do messengerial work is in contravention of the guidelines mentioned in Reference Book on Staff matters, copy of which is marked as Ex. W8. Further, the appointment of daily wage basis for regular messengerial jobs etc. are strictly prohibited as per bank's circulars/instructions. In

such circumstances, the absorption of casuals along with the eligible categories is not valid. Therefore, these persons who were engaged by the Respondent/Bank on casual basis should not be given permanent appointment in the bank service. Those casuals were given more beneficial treatment in the matter of arriving at qualifying service for interview and selection. But, temporary employees have not been informed about this amendment which includes casuals affecting their interest and chance. Further, as per instructions in Ex. W2 four types of waiting lists have to be prepared. But the Respondent/Bank has alleged to have prepared only one wait list for each module as per Ex. M10 in this case. Those candidates under Ex. M10 were found suitable for appointment as messengers and sweepers. Even MW1 is unable to say as to when the wait list Ex. M10 was prepared, but it is mentioned in Ex. M10 that it was prepared based on the settlement dated 17-11-87, 27-10-88 and 9-1-91 which are marked as Exts. M1, M3 and M4 respectively. But, when MW1 has spoken about the settlements, he deposed that settlement dated 27-10-88 was not included in the Madras circle since the High Court order is there, but he has not produced any document in support of the so called non-inclusion except his bald statement. Further, according to MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 was prepared on 2-5-92 but there is no pleading in the Counter Statement with regard to this wait list. Further the Hon'ble High Court has held in its order dated 23-7-99 in W. P. No. 7872 of 1991, which is marked as an exhibit, in which it is stated that 'it is clear that the 1987 settlement was concerned with the temporary class IV employees who were paid scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement while the 1988 settlement dealt with daily wages in Class IV category who were paid wages daily on mutual agreement basis. In such circumstances, as rightly contended the Respondent are not justified and combined the list of candidates covered under 1987 settlement and 1988 settlement since they formed two distinct and separate classes and they cannot treat one class and their action undoubtedly amounts to violation of Article 14 of Constitution of India.' Further, the averment of MW1 and the statements in Counter Statement are contrary to the above and it is nothing but a desperate attempt to wriggle out the illegality committed or perpetrated by the Respondent/Bank by combining equals with unequals. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that as per deposition of MW1 wait list under Ex. M10 comprises of both messengerial and non-messengerial candidates. While the temporary employees were appointed after due process of selection and were paid wages on the basis of industrywise settlement, it is not so in the case of casuals. Therefore, both belongs to two different and distinct categories. But, Ex. M3 provides for the same norms to the casuals as in the case of temporary employees in the matter of absorption. Therefore, it is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India. Therefore, the Petitioner contended that preparation of Ex. M10 namely wait list is not in conformity with the instructions of Ex. M2 and non-preparation of separate panels amounts to violation of circular. Secondly, it has not been prepared as per instructions in Ex. W2 circular regarding projected vacancies for the period from 1987 to 1994. Furthermore, no wait list was released/

published even after the Court order in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 directing the Respondent/Bank to release the list of successful candidates pursuant to the first advertisement published in The Hindu dated 1-8-88. Furthermore, wait list under Ex. M10 does not carry particulars about the candidates date of initial appointment and the number of days put in by them to arrive at their respective seniority. From all these things, it is clear that Ex. M10 has been prepared in violation of instructions and ceased to have the credibility attached to the wait list. Above all, Ex. M1 was not produced at the time of conciliation proceedings held during the year 1997-98 held at Chennai and Madurai and only during the year 2003 the Respondent/Bank produced the wait list Ex. M10 before this Tribunal marking it as a confidential document. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the Respondent/Bank has alleged that these petitioners were engaged in leave vacancy, they have not been told at the time of initial appointment that their appointment was in leave vacancy. Further, even before or after the settlement on absorption of temporary employees, the expression that they were engaged in leave vacancy was used as a device to take them out of the principal clause 2(oo) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Though the Petitioner's work in the Respondent/Bank is continuous and though the Petitioner has performed the duties continuously which is still in existence, the categorisation as such is not valid and the provisions of Sastry Award are also violated. Further, the representative of the Petitioner relied on the rulings reported in 1985 4 SCC 201 H.D. Singh Vs. Reserve Bank of India and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "to employ workmen as 'badlies' casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for many years with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen is illegal." Learned representative further contended that Ex. M10 wait list has not been prepared in accordance with principle of seniority in the legal sense, since the selected candidates with longest service should have priority over those who joined the service later and therefore, the wait list under Ex. M10 which has been drawn up is contrary to law and also bad in law. Thus, the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the law and the spirit of the settlement, but in utter violation and in breach of it. Though clause 2(e) of Ex. M4 states that candidates found suitable for permanent appointment will be offered appointment against existing/future vacancy anywhere in module or circle and in case, a candidate fails to accept the offer of appointment or posting within the prescribed period, he will be deemed to have refused it and the name shall stand deleted from the respective panel and he shall have no further claim for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank. The Respondent/Bank has not produced any document to show how he has arrived at the seniority and till date, it is a mystery as to who that senior was and there is no documentary evidence in support of the averment and also for the averment of MW1. Therefore, the termination of the Petitioner who was in regular service of the Respondent/Bank is arbitrary, mala fide and illegal and the Respondent/Bank has not acted in accordance with the terms of settlement on absorption of temporary employees. Though the Respondent/Bank has produced

Ex. M6 which alleged to be a copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9-6-75 before Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Hyderabad, it is neither a 18(3) settlement nor 12(3) settlement as claimed by the Respondent/Bank which says only with regard to modification of Ex. M1 to M4 made in terms of Ex. M6. Though the Respondent/Bank produced Exts. M7 and M11 interim orders passed by High Court of Madras in WMP No. 11932/91 in W. P. No. 7872/91 ceased to have any relevance when the main writ has been disposed of in the year 1999 and therefore, they do not have any bearing in the case of the Petitioner. Further, though the Respondent/Management has examined two witnesses, the deposition of management witnesses during the cross-examination had become apparent that they have no personal knowledge about the settlements which are marked as Ex. M1 to M5. Above all, though the Respondent/Bank has referred to voluntary retirement scheme, in the Respondent/Bank it was implemented only in the year 2001 and it constitutes post reference period and hence evidence of Respondent/Bank has no application to the Petitioner's case. The Petitioners have completed the service of 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months as enshrined under Sections 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, therefore, their retrenchment from service is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of Section 25 and therefore, they are deemed to be in continuous service of the Respondent/Bank and they are entitled to the benefits under the provisions of I. D. Act. It is further contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though some of the Petitioners in the connected I. Ds have not completed 240 days, since the Respondent/Bank has not taken into consideration and not included the Sundays and paid holidays as days on which the Petitioners have actually worked and hence, they have also completed 240 days in a period of 12 calendar months. He also relied on the rulings reported in 1985 II LLJ 539 Workmen of American Express International Banking Corporation Vs. Management of American Express International Banking Corporation wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the expression 'actually worked under the employer' cannot mean that those days only when the workmen worked with hammer, sickle or pen but must necessarily comprehend all those days during which they were in the employment of the employer and for which he had been paid wages either under express or implied contract of service or by compulsion of statute, standing orders etc.". It is further argued that call letters produced by the Petitioner will clearly prove that the Respondent/Bank has conducted the interview and selected the temporary employees who have reported to have submitted their application for absorption as per the bank's circular and therefore, their retrenchment is illegal. In all these cases, the Petitioners were in employment as sub-staff in early 1980s but were denied further engagement on account of settlements/lapsing of wait lists and out of these Petitioners some of them have completed 240 days and more in a continuous period of 12 calendar months and they are in age group of 40 to 50 years and for no fault of theirs, they find themselves stranded in life midstream. They have also not gainfully employed. In such circumstances, this Tribunal has to pass an award in their favour.

10. But, as against this, the learned senior counsel for the Respondent/Bank contended that the reference made by the Government itself is not maintainable in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. The Petitioner in this case and the Petitioners in the connected disputes were not in continuous service. Hence, the question of regular appointment/absorption does not arise at all and their engagement was not authorised. Further, the Petitioners are estopped from making claim as they had accepted the settlements drawn under the provisions of Sections 18(1) and 18(3) of the I. D. Act, in lieu of the provisions of law and implemented by the Respondent/Bank and the claim of the Petitioners are not bona fide and are made with ulterior motive. Further, they have concealed the material facts that the Petitioner was wait listed as per length of his engagement and could not be absorbed as he was positioned down in the seniority. The Respondent/Bank was engaging temporary employees due to business exigency for the performance of duties as messenger. Further, the allegation that he was sponsored by Employment Exchange is incorrect and the allegation that he worked as temporary messenger is also incorrect, they were engaged against leave vacancies. The settlement entered into by the Respondent/Bank and the federation were bona fide which were the only workable solution and is binding on the Petitioner. The Petitioner accepted the settlement and accordingly he was wait listed and therefore, the Petitioner is estopped from questioning the settlement directly or indirectly and his claim is liable to be rejected. Furthermore, the said settlements were not questioned by any union and the settlements were bank level settlements and operate throughout the country. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1991 1 LLJ 323 Associated Glass Industries Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal A.P. and Others wherein under Section 12(3) the union entered into a settlement with the management settling the claim of 11 workmen and the workmen resigned from the job and received terminal benefits, but the workmen raised a plea before the Tribunal that they did not resign voluntarily. But the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that "in the absence of plea that the settlement reached in the course of conciliation is vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation or coercion, the settlement is binding on the workmen." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 1189 Ashok and Others Vs. Maharashtra State Transport Corporation and Others wherein the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that "therefore a settlement arrived at in the course of the conciliation proceedings with a recognised majority union will be binding on all workmen of the establishment, even those who belong to the minority union which had objected to the same. To that extent, it departs from the ordinary law of contracts, the object obviously is to uphold the sanctity of settlements reached with the active assistance of the conciliation officer and to discourage an individual employee or a minority union from scuttling the settlement." It further held that "there may be exceptional cases, where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. But, in the absence of such allegations, a settlement in the course of collective bargaining is entitled to due weight and

consideration." Learned counsel for the Respondent further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 1 LLJ 308 K. C. P. Ltd. Vs. Presiding Officer and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement are divided into two categories namely (i) those arrived at outside the conciliation proceedings under Section 18(1) of the I.D. Act and (ii) those arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings under Section 18(3). A settlement of the first category has limited application and binds merely parties to it and settlement of the second category made with a recognised majority union has extended application as it will be binding on all workmen of the establishment. Even in case of the first category, if the settlement was reached with a representative union of which the contesting workmen were members and if there was nothing unreasonable or unfair in the terms of the settlement, it must be binding on the contesting workmen also." He further relied on the rulings reported in AIR 2000 SC 469 National Engineering Industries Ltd. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "settlement is arrived at by the free will of the parties and is a pointer to there being good will between them. When there is a dispute that the settlement is not bona fide in nature or that it has been arrived at on account of fraud, misrepresentation or concealment of facts or even corruption and other inducements, it could be subject matter of yet another industrial dispute which an appropriate Govt. may refer for adjudication after examining the allegations as there is an underlying assumption that the settlement reached with the help of the conciliation officer must be fair and reasonable." Relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that though it is alleged that they are not parties to the settlement, since the federation in which the Petitioner is also one among them, they have entered into settlement with the bank and therefore, it is binding on the Petitioner. Further, he argued that no union of the bank has questioned the settlement and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is not binding on them and he is estopped from disputing the same.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent further contended that though the reference made in this case and other connected disputes is 'whether the demand of the workman with wait list No. given for restoring the wait list of temporary messengers in the establishment of Respondent/Bank and consequential appointment thereupon as temporary messenger is justified?' The Petitioner contended that the retrenchment made by the Respondent/Bank is not valid and he has to be reinstated in service with full back wages etc. Hence, the Petitioner's contention against the reference made by the Govt. is not valid. Further, in this case, the Court has to see whether the restoration of wait list can be made as contended by the Petitioner and not reinstatement as alleged by the Petitioner in the Claim Statement.

12. But, as against this on behalf of the Petitioner it is contended that mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference and he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 345 Secretary, Kollam Jilla Hotel and Shop Workers Union Vs. Industrial Tribunal,

Kollam wherein the Kerala High Court has held that "mere wording of reference is not decisive in the matter of tenability of a reference. Even though the Tribunal cannot go beyond the order of reference, if points of difference are discernible from the material before it, it has only on duty and that is to decide the points on merits and not to find out some technical defects in the wording of reference, subjecting the poor workman to hardship involved in moving the machinery again." It further held that "the Tribunal should look into the pleading and find out the exact nature of pleading of the Petitioner to find out the exact nature of dispute instead of refusing to answer the reference on merits." Further, he argued that the Tribunal has got power to go into the question whether the Petitioner is to be reinstated in service or not for which he relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1664 Van Sagnathan Orient Paper Mills Vs. Industrial Tribunal & Ors. wherein the Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that "the Tribunal cannot go behind the terms of reference, but that does not mean that it cannot look into the pleadings of parties." He also relied on the rulings reported in 1998 LAB IC 1507 A. Sambanthan Vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Madras, wherein it has been held that "it has been repeatedly held that the Labour Court should not attempt to consider the order under reference in a technical manner or a pedantic manner, but should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner." He also argued that in Express Newspapers P. Ltd. case reported in AIR 1993 SC 569 the Supreme Court has held that "the Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider all incidental matters also and the order of reference should not be construed in the manner which would prolong the industrial adjudication. The Labour Court is expected to decide the real nature of disputes between the parties and with that object in view, it should consider the order of reference in a fair and reasonable manner, though the order of reference is not happily framed nor was it framed to the high expectation of the Labour Court." Relying on all these decisions, the representative for the Petitioner argued that though in the reference, it is not mentioned that whether the retrenchment is valid or not, from the pleadings it is clear that the Petitioners have been retrenched from the Respondent/Bank and therefore, this Tribunal can look into the pleadings of the Petitioners and can decide whether the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated in service as alleged by him and whether he is entitled to the back wages as alleged by him. Therefore, the argument advanced on the side of the Respondent that it is beyond the scope of reference is without any substance.

13. I find some force in the contention of the representative for the Petitioner. Therefore, I find this Tribunal is entitled to go into the question whether the relief prayed for by the Petitioner can be given to him or not? But, I find that the settlement was validly entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since it is not questioned by any of the unions of the Respondent/Bank, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to question the settlement.

14. Then the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner mentioned that he has been kept in the wait list and the time of wait list has been

exhausted, now the Petitioner cannot question that he should be reinstated in service and he relied on the rulings reported in 1996 3 SCC 139 Union of India and Others Vs. K. V. Vijeesh wherein the Supreme Court has held that "the only question which falls for determination in this appeal is whether a candidate whose name appears in the select list on the basis of competitive examination acquires a right of appointment in Govt. service in an existing or a future vacancy". In that case, pruning of select list on reduction in number of vacancies was made in view of the impending absorption of steam surplus staff and a policy decision has been taken to reduce the number of vacancies and consequently, a certain number of bottom persons were removed from the select list and the remaining selectees were given appointments according to their comparative merits. In which, the Supreme Court has held that "in such circumstances, denial of appointment to the persons removed from the select list is not arbitrary and discriminatory." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1997 6 SCC 584 Syndicate Bank & Ors. Vs. Shankar Paul and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "by its letter dated 7-2-87 the bank informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the services of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was a yearly panel expiring on 6-2-98, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right because of inclusion of their names in the said panel for permanent absorption in the services of the bank. Whatever conditional right they had come to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents as contained in the W.P. was thus misconceived and therefore, the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal were right in dismissing the Writ Petition and the appeal respectively." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1991 3 SCC 47 Shankarsan Dash Vs. Union of India wherein the Supreme Court has held that "candidates included in merit list has no indefeasible right to appointment even if a vacancy exists" and relying on all these decisions, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has no right to question the wait list and since there is no mala fide on the part of the Respondent/Bank in preparing the wait list, it cannot be said that preparation of wait list was made with mala fide motive. Under such circumstances, after the expiry of the date namely 31-3-1997, the Petitioner cannot plead for restoration of the wait list and he cannot pray for reinstatement as alleged by him. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in 1992 LAB IC 2168 State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Piara Singh and Others wherein the Supreme Court has held that "now coming to the direction that all those ad hoc temporary employees who have continued for more than a year should be regularised, we find it difficult to sustain it. The direction has been given without reference to the existence of a vacancy. The direction in effect means that every ad hoc/temporary employee who has been continued for one year should be regularised even though (a) no vacancy is available for him which means creation of a vacancy; (b) he was not sponsored by Employment Exchange nor was he appointed in pursuance of a

notification calling for applications which means he had entered by a backdoor; (c) he was not eligible and qualified for the post at the time of his appointment; (d) his record of service since his appointment is not satisfactory. These are the additional problems indicated by us in para 12 which would arise from giving of such blanket orders. None of the decisions relied upon by the High Court justify such wholesale, unconditional orders. Moreover, from the mere continuation of an adhoc employee for one year, it cannot be presumed that there is need for regular post. Such a presumption may be justified only when such continuance extends to several years. Further, there can be no rule of thumb in such matters. Conditions and circumstances of one unit may not be the same as of the other. Just because in one case, a direction was given to regularise employees who have put in one year's service as far as possible, and subject to fulfilling the qualifications, it cannot be held that in each and every case, such a direction must follow irrespective of and without taking into account the other relevant circumstances and considerations. The relief must be moulded in each case having regard to all the relevant facts and circumstances of that case. It cannot be a mechanical act but a judicious one. From this, the impugned directions must be held to be totally untenable and unsustainable. Thus, the Supreme Court set aside the orders of lower Courts. He further relied on the decision reported in 1997 II SCC 1 *Ashwani Kumar and Others Vs. State of Bihar and Others* wherein the full Bench of the Supreme Court has considered the above regularisation of appointment in excess of sanctioned posts. "So far as the question of confirmation of these employees whose entry itself was illegal and void is concerned, it is to be noted that question of confirmation or regularisation of an irregularly appointed candidate would arise, if the candidate concerned is appointed in an irregular manner or on adhoc basis against an available vacancy which is already sanctioned. But, if the initial entry itself is unauthorised and is not against any sanctioned vacancy, question of regularising the incumbent on such a non-existing vacancy would never survive for consideration and even if such purported regularisation or confirmation is given, it would be an exercise in futility. It would amount to decorating a still born baby. Under these circumstances, there was no occasion to regularise them or to give them valid confirmation. The so called exercise of confirming these employees, therefore, remained a nullity." Therefore, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that these temporary employees were appointed only due to exigencies and they have not appointed against any regular vacancy and they have only appointed in leave vacancies and therefore, they are not entitled to claim any absorption in the Respondent/Bank. Further, he relied on the rulings reported in AIR 1997 SCC 3657 *Himanshu Kumar Vidarthi & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.* wherein the Supreme Court has held that "they are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the I.D. Act. The concept of retrenchment, therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees. Since they are only daily wage employees and have no right to the posts, their

disengagement is not arbitrary." He further relied on the rulings reported in 1994 3 LLJ (Supp) 754 wherein the Rajasthan High Court has held that "Under Section 25G of the I.D. Act retrenchment procedure following principle of 'last come—first go' is not mandatory but only directory, on sufficient grounds shown, the employer is permitted to depart from the said principle retrenching seniors and retaining juniors." Though in this case, the Petitioner has alleged that his juniors have been made permanent in banking service, he has not established with any evidence that his juniors were made permanent by the Respondent/Bank. Anyhow, if the Petitioner has shown anything, the Respondent/Bank is ready to establish the fact before this Tribunal that he has worked more days than the Petitioner. In such circumstances, the prayer for reinstatement in the services of Respondent/Bank cannot be given to the Petitioner and therefore, the claim is to be dismissed with costs.

15. Learned Senior Advocate further argued that even in recent decision reported in 2006 4 SCC 1 *Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi*, the Supreme Court has held that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules. It is not open to the Court to prevent regular recruitment at the instance of temporary employees whose period of employment has come to an end or of ad-hoc employees who by the very nature of their appointment, do not acquire any right." Further, it has also held that "it is not as if, the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature is not aware of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arms length since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment, perpetuate illegalities and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible." Further, the Supreme Court while laying down the law, has clearly held that "unless the appointment is in terms of the relevant rules and after a proper competition among qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. It has to be clarified that merely because a temporary employee or a casual wage worker is continued for a time beyond the term of his appointment, he would not be entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance, if the original appointment was not made by following a due process of selection as envisaged by relevant rules." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 443 *National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh*, wherein the Supreme Court has held that "regularisation furthermore, is not a mode of appointment and if appointment is made without following

the rules, the same being a nullity, the question of confirmation of an employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise." Further, in CDJ 2006 SC 395 Municipal Council, Sujampur Vs. Surinder Kumar, the Supreme Court has held that "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in sanctioned post. Being a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the recruitment rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules as also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be void in law." Further, in 2006 2 LLN 89 Madhya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Vs. S.C. Pandey wherein the Supreme Court has held that "only because an employee had worked for more than 240 days of service by that itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularised in service." The Supreme Court also held that "the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of this Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, in view of the settled legal position, as noticed hereinbefore."

16. Relying on all these decision, learned counsel for the Respondent contended that since the Petitioner has not been appointed for regular post nor has he been appointed in regular vacancy or sanctioned post, the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation of his service. Further, when they have not been questioned the five settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation and since they have not questioned the wait list prepared by the Respondent/Bank, they are not entitled to dispute the same and they are estopped from doing so. Further, their prayer before the labour authorities was only to restore the wait list and also for appointment thereon as temporary messenger as per wait list. Under such circumstances, after expiry of the period mentioned in the settlements which were subsequently amended by settlements, the Petitioners cannot now question either the preparation of wait list or number allotted to them. Under such circumstances, it cannot be questioned by the Petitioner.

17. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Though in the Claim Statement, the Petitioners have made so many allegations with regard to preparation of wait list and also settlements entered into between the Respondent/Bank and Federation, at the time of reference, they have not questioned the settlement nor the number allotted to each individual in the wait list. Further, the Petitioners have not questioned the settlement and they have not alleged that settlement was not a bona fide in nature or it has been arrived at on account of mala fide, misrepresentation, fraud or even corruption or other inducements. Under such circumstances, I find the Petitioners cannot now question the settlements at this stage and since they are only temporary employees and since it is not shown before this Tribunal that the Respondent/Bank has got sanctioned posts for temporary employees to be absorbed, I find the Petitioners cannot

claim for reinstatement or regularisation in services of the Respondent/Bank.

18. Further, the representative for the Petitioner contended that in a similar cases, this Tribunal had ordered for reinstatement with back wages and these disputes are also similar in nature and hence, the Petitioners are entitled for the same relief.

19. But, I find since the Supreme Court has held that temporary employees are not entitled to claim any rights for regularisation, merely because they have completed 240 days of continuous service in a period of 12 calendar months and the Supreme Court has also held that each case must be considered on its own merit and the changes brought about by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Govt. in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalisation, privatisation and outsourcing is evident, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to claim regularisation or reinstatement in the Respondent/Bank as alleged by him. Therefore, I find this point against the Petitioner.

Point No. 2 :

The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled ?

20. In view of my foregoing findings that the petitioner is a temporary employee and he is not entitled to be absorbed in regular service or made permanent merely on the strength of such continuance of work, I find the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him. No costs.

21. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 31st January, 2007.)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the Petitioner : WW1 Sri K. Murugan
WW2 Sri V.S. Ekambaram

For the Respondent : MW1 Sri C. Mariappan
MW2 Sri C. Ramalingam

Documents Marked :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	01-08-88	Xerox copy of the paper publication in daily Thanthi based on Ex. M1.
W2	20-04-88	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines issued by Respondent/Bank for implementation of Ex. M1.
W3	24-04-91	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding absorption of daily wagers in Messenger vacancies.

Ex. No.	Date	Description	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W4	01-05-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu on daily wages based on Ex. W4.	W22	17-03-97	Xerox copy of the service particulars—J. Velmurigan.
W5	20-08-91	Xerox copy of the advertisement in The Hindu extending period of qualifying service to daily wagers.	W23	26-03-97	Xerox copy of the letter advising selection of part time Menjal—G. Pandi.
W6	15-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular letter of Zonal Office, Chennai about filling up of vacancies of messenger posts.	W24	31-03-97	Xerox copy of the appointment order to Sri G. Pandi.
W7	25-03-97	Xerox copy of the circular of Respondent/Bank to all Branches regarding identification of messenger vacancies and filling them before 31-3-97.	W25	Feb. 2005	Xerox copy of the pay slip of T. Sekar for the month of February, 2005 wait list No. 395 of Madurai Circle.
W8	Nil	Xerox copy of the instruction in Reference book on staff about casuals not to be engaged at office/branches to do messengerial work.	W26	13-02-95	Xerox copy of the Madurai Module Circular letter about engaging temporary employees from the panel of wait list.
W9	07-04-84	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W27	09-11-92	Xerox copy of the Head Office circular No. 28 regarding norms for sanction of messenger staff.
W10	08-03-85	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W28	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the minutes of the Bipartite meeting.
W11	01-04-86	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W29	09-07-92	Xerox copy of the settlement between Respondent/Bank and All India Staff Bank of India Staff Federation for implementation of norms—creation of part time general attendants.
W12	03-11-92	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W30	07-02-06	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about conversion of part time employees and redesignate them as general attendants.
W13	08-01-94	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	W31	31-12-85	Xerox copy of the local Head Office circular about Appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre.
W14	30-03-95	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	For the Respondent/Management :		
W15	16-03-96	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	Ex. No.	Date	Description
W16	30-05-97	Xerox copy of the service certificate issued by Guindy Branch.	M1	17-11-87	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W17	Nil	Xerox copy of the administrative guidelines in reference book on staff matters issued by Respondent/Bank regarding recruitment to subordinate cadre and service conditions.	M2	16-07-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W18	Nil	Xerox copy of the Reference book on staff matters Vol. III consolidated upto 31-12-95.	M3	27-10-88	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W19	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—V. Muralikannan.	M4	09-01-91	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W20	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—K. Subburaj.	M5	30-07-96	Xerox copy of the settlement.
W21	06-03-97	Xerox copy of the call letter from Madurai zonal office for interview of messenger post—J. Velmurigan.	M6	09-06-95	Xerox copy of the minutes of conciliation proceedings.
			M7	28-05-91	Xerox copy of the order in W.P. No. 7872/91.
			M8	15-05-98	Xerox copy of the order in O.P. No. 2787/97 of High Court of Orissa.
			M9	10-07-99	Xerox copy of the order of Supreme Court in SLP No. 3082/99.
			M10	Nil	Xerox copy of the wait list of Chennai Module.
			M11	25-10-99	Xerox copy of the order passed in CMP No. 16289 and 16290/99 in W.A. No. 1893/99.